DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 872 95 EA 009 131

AUTHOR	DeArman, John W.
TITLE	Investigation of the Abandonment Rate and Causes of Abandonment of Innovative Practices in Secondary Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Columbia.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Jun 75
GRANT	NIE-G-74-0005
NOTE	366p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$19.41 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Curriculum; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Innovation; Educational Programs; *Educational Technology; High Schools; Instructional Innovation; *Organizational Change; Private Schools; Public Schools; School Surveys; Secondary Education; *Statistical Data; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The adoption of educational innovations by secondary schools, their abandonment, and the causes for abandonment are the subjects of this study. The researchers surveyed 3,271 high schools accredited by the North Central Association, including both public and private schools. School administrators were questioned about the history in their schools of 33 educational innovations relating to curriculum, technology, and organization. The majority of the schools responding to the questionnaires were larger, moderately to well financed, public schools located mainly in communities other than small towns or rural areas. The innovation adoption average for these schools was 9.7, while abandonment averaged .76. The innovations most frequently abandoned were those that were complex, expensive, and difficult to administer, such as flexible scheduling, programmed instruction, and team teaching. The innovations most frequently retained were simpler, less expensive, and easier to administer, such as simulation and gaming, independent study, and ethnic studies. When abandonment did occur, it usually came primarily as a result of factors within the schools related to personnel (specifically, teacher resistance) and pupil outcomes. Statistical tables contain data on each of the 33 innovations, as well as data concerning school characteristics. (Author/DS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED133872

Final Report

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Grant Number NIE-G-74-0005

Investigation of the Abandonment Rate and Causes of Abandonment of Innovative Practices in Secondary Schools

Advisor: Researcher:

Neil C. Aslin, Ed.D. John W. DeArman, Ed.D.
University of Missouri - Columbia

June 15, 1975

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education. Points of view or opinions stated herein do not necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

National Institute of Education

EA 009 131

Final Report

Grant Number NIE-G-74-0005

Investigation of the Abandonment Rate and Causes of Abandonment of Innovative Practices in Secondary Schools

John W. DeArman, Ed.D.
University of Missouri - Columbia

June 15, 1975

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education. Points of view or opinions stated herein do not necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

National Institute of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1

The Purposes of the Research 1

Background 2

Need for the Study 7

Research Questions 12

Definition of Terms 13

Limitations of the Research 18

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 19

Change Theory 20

Some Factors That Support Innovation 25

Some Barriers to Innovation 32

Why are Innovations Abandoned? 37

Summary 46

III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES 48

Population 48

Procedure 48

Instrumentation 48

Analysis and Reporting of Data 51

Second Questionnaire 52

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA 53

Description of Responding Schools 53

CHAPTER PAGE

Responding Schools by Enrollment 53

Responding Schools by Per-Pupil Expenditure . 54

Responding Schools by Source of Support . . . 55

Responding Schools by Type of Community . . . 57

General Status of Innovations in the Responding Schools in the Study 58

Abandonment of Innovations by Schools Reporting Adoption 63

Status of Innovations by School Enrollment . . 66

Status of Innovations In Schools of Fewer Than 200 Students 66

Status of Innovations In Schools of 200-499 Pupils 68

Status of Innovations In Schools of 500-1,499 Pupils 71

Status of Innovations In Schools of 1,500-2,499 Pupils 74

Status of Innovations In Schools of 2,500 Pupils or More 76

Status of Innovations by Per-Pupil Expenditures for Instructional Purposes 79

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of Less Than $500 . . . 79

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of $500-$799 82

CHAPTER PAGE

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of $800-$1,500 85
Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of Over $1,500 88
Status of Innovations by Source of Support of School 90
Status of Innovations in Public Schools 91
Status of Innovations in Parochial or Diocesan Schools 93
Status of Innovations in Private, Religious Affiliated Schools 94
Status of Innovations in Private, Not Religious Affiliated Schools 96
Status of Innovations in Government Schools . . 98
Status of Innovations By Type of Community in Which School is Located 102
Status of Innovations in Schools in Communities of Over 400,000 Residents 102
Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 300,000-399,999 105
Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 200,000-299,999 107
Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 100,000-199,999 110
Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 5,000-99,999 112

CHAPTER PAGE

Status of Innovations in Suburban Schools . . 114

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Towns of Under 5,000 Residents 117

Status of Innovations in Rural Schools . . . 119

Adoption of Innovations in Responding Schools . 122

Abandonment of Innovations in Responding Schools 124

Adoption and Abandonment of Innovations by Percent of Schools Reporting Adoption and Abandonment 126

Adoption and Abandonment of Innovations in Order of Relative Frequency 130

Average Number of Innovations Adopted or Abandoned by Responding Schools 133

Year of Adoption of Innovations 136

Number of Innovations Reported Never Adopted by Responding Schools 139

Individuals, Organizations and Groups Influencing Adoption of Innovations Abandoned After Trial 141

Extent of Influence of Administrators Upon Adoption 141

Extent of Influence of Teachers, Parents, and Students Upon Adoption 143

Extent of Influence of Boards of Education Upon Adoption 143

CHAPTER PAGE

Extent of Influence of State Departments of Education, Regional Accrediting Agency, and Federal Government Agencies Upon Adoption 146

Extent of Influence of Publishing and Media Companies Upon Adoption 146

Extent of Influence of the Results of Educational Research Upon Adoption 148

Extent of Influence of Other Varied Individuals, Groups, and Agencies Upon Adoption . 148

Impetus For Adoption of Innovations by General Categories of Curriculum, Organization, and Technology 151

Individual Sources of Impetus for Adoption . 153

Reasons for Abandonment of Innovations 155

Reasons for Abandonment of PSSC Physics . . . 155

Reasons for Abandonment of Harvard Physics . 157

Reasons for Abandonment of ESCP Physical Science 157

Reasons for Abandonment of SSSP Physical Science 160

Reasons for Abandonment of IPS Physical Science 162

Reasons for Abandonment of Humanities Courses 164

Reasons for Abandonment of Career Education . 164

CHAPTER PAGE

Reasons for Abandonment of Independent Study Programs 167
Reasons for Abandonment of Mini-Courses . . . 169
Reasons for Abandonment of Learning Packages 171
Reasons for Abandonment of HSGP Geography . . 171
Reasons for Abandonment of Individual Prescription of Instruction 173
Reasons for Abandonment of SRSS Sociology . . 175
Reasons for Abandonment of Ethnic Studies . . 178
Reasons for Abandonment of Television Instruction 180
Reasons for Abandonment of Programmed Instruction 180
Reasons for Abandonment of Teaching Machines 182
Reasons for Abandonment of Telephone Amplification 184
Reasons for Abandonment of Simulation and Gaming 186
Reasons for Abandonment of Data Processing Equipment 188
Reasons for Abandonment of Computer Assisted Instruction 191
Reasons for Abandonment of Flexible Scheduling 193
Reasons for Abandonment of Team Teaching . . 195
Reasons for Abandonment of College Credit Courses 197

CHAPTER PAGE

Reasons for Abandonment of Non-Graded Programs 199
Reasons for Abandonment of Teacher Aides or Para-Professionals 201
Reasons for Abandonment of Differentiated Staffing 203
Reasons for Abandonment of School-Within-A-School Plans 203
Reasons for Abandonment of Cultural Enrichment Programs 206
Reasons for Abandonment of Optional Class Attendance 208
Reasons for Abandonment of Extended School Year 210
Reasons for Abandonment of Action Learning . 212
Reasons for Abandonment of Early Leaving Plan 212
Reasons for Abandonment of Innovations in Order of Relative Frequency 214
Reasons for Abandonment by General Classification of Reasons 216
Data Derived from Follow-up Questionnaire . . . 219
Student Population for Which Innovation Was Designed 219
Degree of Implementation 221
Duration of Abandoned Innovations 223
Source of Abandoned Innovations 225

CHAPTER PAGE

Modifications Made in Innovations Later Abandoned by Responding Schools 227

Summary 238

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 243

Summary of the Study 243

Findings 245

Description of Responding Schools 245

Status of Innovations in Responding Schools 246

Findings Relative to Research Questions . . 247

Findings From Second Questionnaire 256

Conclusions 258

Implications 263

Recommendations For Further Study 265

BIBLIOGRAPHY 267

APPENDIX A 276

APPENDIX B 286

APPENDIX C 289

APPENDIX D 309

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Responding Schools by Enrollment 54

II. Responding Schools by Annual Per-Pupil Expenditure for Instructional Purposes 55

III. Responding Schools by Source of Support 56

IV. Responding Schools by Type of Community in Which the School is Located 57

V. Status of Thirty-three Selected Innovations in Responding Schools 62

VI. Abandonment of Innovations by Schools Reporting Adoption 65

VII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools of Fewer Than 200 Pupils 67

VIII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools of 200-499 Pupils 70

IX. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools of 500-1,499 Pupils 73

X. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools of 1,500-2,499 Pupils 75

XI. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools of Over 2,500 Pupils 78

XII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools With Expenditures for Instructional Purposes of Less than $500 Per Pupil 81

TABLE PAGE

XIII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools With Expenditures for Instructional Purposes of $500-$799 Per Pupil 84

XIV. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools With Expenditures for Instructional Purposes of $800-$1,500 Per Pupil 87

XV. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools With Expenditures for Instructional Purposes of Over $1,500 Per Pupil 89

XVI. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Public Schools 92

XVII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Parochial or Diocesan Schools 95

XVIII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Private, Religious Affiliated Schools 97

XIX. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Private, Not Religious Affiliated Schools . . 99

XX. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Government Schools 101

XXI. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Cities of Over 400,000 Residents 104

XXII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Non-Suburban Communities of 300,000-399,999 Residents 106

XXIII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding

TABLE PAGE

Schools Located in Non-Suburban Communities of 200,000-299,999 Residents 109

XXIV. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Non-Suburban Communities of 100,000-199,999 Residents 111

XXV. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Non-Suburban Communities of 5,000-99,999 Residents 113

XXVI. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Suburban Communities Within Urban Fringe of Central City 116

XXVII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Towns of Under 5,000 Residents 118

XXVIII. Status of Thirty-three Innovations in Responding Schools Located in Rural Areas 121

XXIX. Innovations Reported Adopted by Responding Schools 123

XXX. Adoption of Thirty-three Innovations by Responding Schools by General Classification of Curriculum, Technology, and Organization 124

XXXI. Innovations Reported Abandoned by Responding Schools 125

XXXII. Abandonment of Thirty-three Innovations by Responding Schools by General Classifications of Curriculum, Technology, and Organization . 126

TABLE PAGE

XXXIII. Innovations Adopted by Responding Schools by Percent of Schools Reporting Adoption 128

XXXIV. Innovations Abandoned Following Adoption by Responding Schools by Percent of Schools Reporting Abandonment 129

XXXV. Adoption of Thirty-three Innovations Reported by Responding Schools in Order of Relative Frequency 131

XXXVI. Abandonment of Thirty-three Innovations Reported by Responding Schools in Order of Relative Frequency 132

XXXVII. Average Number of Thirty-three Innovations Reported Adopted and/or Abandoned by Responding Schools by Enrollment 134

XXXVIII. Average Number of Thirty-three Innovations Reported Adopted and/or Abandoned by Responding Schools by Per Pupil Expenditure 135

XXXIX. Average Number of Thirty-three Innovations Adopted and/or Abandoned by Responding Schools by Source of Support 135

XL. Average Number of Thirty-three Innovations Adopted and/or Abandoned by Responding Schools by Type of Community in Which School is Located 136

XLI. Year of Adoption of Innovations Reported by Responding Schools 137

TABLE		PAGE
XLII.	Year of Adoption of Innovations Reported Abandoned by Responding Schools	138
XLIII.	Innovations Reported Never Adopted by Responding Schools	140
XLIV.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which Administrators Participated in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial	142
XLV.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which Teachers, Students, and Parents Participated in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial	144
XLVI.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which Boards of Education Participated in the Impetus of Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial	145
XLVII.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which State Departments of Education Regional Accrediting Agency and Federal Government Agencies Participated in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial	147
XLVIII.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which Publishing and Media Companies Participated in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial	149
XLIX.	Reports by Responding Schools in Which the Results of Educational Research Played a Role in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later	

TABLE PAGE

Abandoned After Trial 150

L. Reports by Responding Schools in Which Other Varied Individuals, Organizations, and Groups Played a Role in the Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial . . . 152

LI. Impetus for Adoption of Innovations Later Abandoned After Trial by General Category of Curriculum, Technology, and Organization 153

LII. Individual Sources of Impetus for Adoption of Abandoned Innovations 154

LIII. Reasons for Abandonment of PSSC Physics Reported by Responding Schools 156

LIV. Reasons for Abandonment of Harvard Physics Reported by Responding Schools 158

LV. Reasons for Abandonment of ESCP Physical Science Reported by Responding Schools 159

LVI. Reasons for Abandonment of SSSP Physical Science 161

LVII. Reasons for Abandonment of IPS Physical Science Reported by Responding Schools 163

LVIII. Reasons for Abandonment of Humanities Courses Reported by Responding Schools 165

LIX. Reasons for Abandonment of Career Education Programs 166

LX. Reasons for Abandonment of Independent Study Programs 168

LXI. Reasons for Abandonment of Mini-Courses 170

TABLE PAGE

LXII. Reasons for Abandonment of Learning Packages . . 172

LXIII. Reasons for Abandonment of H.S.G.P. Geography . 174

LXIV. Reasons for Abandonment of Individual Prescription of Instruction 176

LXV. Reasons for Abandonment of SRSS Sociology . . . 177

LXVI. Reasons for Abandonment of Ethnic Studies . . . 179

LXVII. Reasons for Abandonment of Television Instruction 181

LXVIII. Reasons for Abandonment of Programmed Instruction 183

LXIX. Reasons for Abandonment of Teaching Machines . . 185

LXX. Reasons for Abandonment of Telephone Amplification 187

LXXI. Reasons for Abandonment of Simulation or Gaming 189

LXXII. Reasons for Abandonment of Data Processing Equipment 190

LXXIII. Reasons for Abandonment of Computer Assisted Instruction 192

LXXIV. Reasons for Abandonment of Flexible Scheduling . 194

LXXV. Reasons for Abandonment of Team Teaching 196

LXXVI. Reasons for Abandonment of College Credit Courses 198

LXXVII. Reasons for Abandonment of Non-Graded Programs . 200

LXXVIII. Reasons for Abandonment of the Use of Teacher Aides or Para-professionals 202

LXXIX. Reasons for Abandonment of Differentiated Staffing 204

LXXX. Reasons for Abandonment of School-Within-A-

TABLE PAGE
School Plans 205
LXXXI. Reasons for Abandonment of Cultural Enrichment Programs 207
LXXXII. Reasons for Abandonment of Optional Class Attendance 209
LXXXIII. Reasons for Abandonment of Extended School Year 211
LXXXIV. Reasons for Abandonment of Action Learning . . 213
LXXXV. Reasons for Abandonment of Early Leaving Plan . 215
LXXXVI. Reasons for Abandonment of Thirty-three Selected Innovations Reported by Responding Schools in Order of Relative Frequency 217
LXXXVII. Reasons for Abandonment of Thirty-three Innovations Reported by Responding Schools by General Classification of Reasons 218
LXXXVIII. Student Population for Which Innovation Was Designed 220
LXXXIX. Degree of Implementation of Innovations Reported Fully Implemented 222
XC. Degree of Implementation of Innovations Reported Being Tried on a Limited Basis 224
XCI. Length of Time Innovation Was in Use Before Abandonment 226
XCII. Source of Innovation Reported Abandoned by Responding Schools 228
XCIII. Average Number of Thirty-three Innovations Adopted and/or Abandoned by Responding Schools by State 290

TABLE PAGE

XCIV. Number and Percentage of Schools by State Reporting Adoption of Thirty-three Selected Innovations 291

XCV. Number and Percentage of Schools by State Reporting Abandonment of Thirty-three Selected Innovations 300

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Which of thirty-three selected innovations in the areas of curriculum, organization, and technology have been abandoned after trial by schools in the survey population; what were the stated reasons for abandonment; what are the implications for planning educational change; and what guidelines can be developed to determine the conditions necessary for probable success of prospective innovations?

The Purposes of the Research

The purposes of this research were:

1. To determine the extent of adoption of thirty-three current secondary school educational innovations in high schools accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

2. To determine the abandonment following trial for each of thirty-three current secondary school educational innovations adopted by the survey population.

3. To identify the causes for abandonment of thirty-three current secondary school educational innovations in the survey population.

Background

The 1960's might be appropriately called the decade of innovation in American public education. Since the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, billions of dollars have been invested in innovative educational programs at the federal, state, and local levels. This investment continues today. In 1972 alone, our expenditure for education totaled $90.5 billion.[1]

Public school educators have responded to this investment by developing and implementing numerous innovations in curriculum, organizational patterns, and use of technology to aid learning. In fact, innovation has become one of the magic words influencing school planning during the past ten to fifteen years. Cass has illustrated this climate for change:

> Education reporting today is very much like snapping a photo of a moving object--by the time the shutter has clicked the picture has changed. Not many years ago it was possible to forecast with reasonable accuracy what the schools would be like a decade hence by looking closely at contemporary classrooms. Action for change was directed primarily toward improving and expanding what already existed--an effort to achieve more of the same. But today the education scene is changing so rapidly that no man can predict with certainty what the schools...will be like. We do know the direction the change is likely to take, and we can identify many of ingredients, but we do not know how fast they will come, and in what combinations they will appear--or what in-

---

[1] "Innovations No Guide to Quality Education," Daily American Republic, Vol. 97, No. 264, (December 1, 1972), p. 4.

> novations will develop as spinoffs of the changes already taking place.[2]

We are experiencing a period of accelerated change in secondary education today in a climate generally favorable for change.[3] The encouragement comes from a variety of sources including the federal government, the public, the news media critical of past practices in education, and from the educators' own awareness of the need to do the job better, perhaps by using different means.

This mood for change is a recent development in education and quite unlike what we have historically come to expect. Mort illustrated our past reluctance to accept change in education. "Educational change proceeds very slowly" he commented.

> After an invention which is destined to spread throughout the school appears, fifteen years typically elapse before it is found in three percent of the school systems....After practices have reached the three percent point of diffusion their rate of spread accelerates. An additional twenty years usually suffices for almost complete diffusion in an area the size of an average state.[4]

On her first encounter with the superintendent of schools in Gopher Prairie, Carol Kennicott inquired:

---

[2] James M. Cass, "Where the Action Is". Saturday Review, (October 15, 1966), p. 69.

[3] Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Why a Strategy for Planned Curriculum Innovation?" Marcella R. Lawler (ed.), Strategies For Planned Curriculum Innovation. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), pp. 8-9.

[4] Paul R. Mort, "Educational Adaptability" in Donald H. Ross, ed., Administration for Adaptability (New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1958), pp. 32-33.

> Tell me, Mr. Mott: Have you ever tried any experiments with any of the new educational systems? The modern kindergarten methods or the Gary system?
>
> Oh. Those. Most of these would-be reformers are simply notoriety-seekers. I believe in manual training, but Latin and mathematics always will be the backbone of sound Americanism, no matter what these faddists advocate--heaven knows what they do want--knitting, I suppose, and classes in wiggling the ears![5]

Snow illustrates resistance to change and the classical view of innovative process:

> In a society like ours, academic patterns change more slowly than any others. In my lifetime, in England, they have crystallized rather than loosened. I used to think it would be about as hard to change, say the Oxford and Cambridge scholarship examination as to conduct a major revolution, I now believe that I was over-optimistic.[6]

The last two accounts are extreme to be sure, but they serve to illustrate that historically, educational innovation and change have not always enjoyed the climate of favorable opinion which the last ten to fifteen years have provided. While it may be argued that attitudes toward innovation in 1974 may be somewhat more conservative than those of five to ten years ago, innovation is still looked upon favorably and expected of the schools.[7]

Brickell, after taking an inventory of instructional innovations in schools in New York State, indicated that the rate of introduction of such innovations more than doubled within fifteen months following the launching of Sputnik I in October, 1957.[8] And Miles has indicated that the trend toward general acceptance of innovation in education is not a temporary matter:

---

[5] Sinclair Lewis, Main Street. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, 1920), pp. 43-44.

[6] C. P. Snow, "Miasma, Darkness and Torpidity". New Statesman, 1961, p. 42.

[7] MacKenzie, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

> It seems fair to say that something more than the usual American sense of meliorism is at work in the current educational scene. The first phase of rightist attacks on the public schools in the early 1950's, the following wave of charges of anti-intellectualism... and the enormous amount of journalistic disputation more or less appropriately tagged the "Great Debate"... seemed finally to have led to a climate in which there is not only a sense of impatience with the existing state of educational establishment, but high willingness to alter and--even--to get down to work. Residue from the "debate" are still in evidence..., but the time for exhortation, polemics, moralism, and defense seems to have passed. The present work output devoted to altering educational practices seems quite remarkable.[9]

Hillson and Hyman further substantiate that educational innovativeness is more than a fad confined to those in the profession. They maintain that the impetus for change comes both from inside and outside education--a condition which is likely to perpetuate the innovative climate.

> It is accurate to report that there are powerful forces both in and out of education which compel those of us in the field to create innovation and reform, in order that our young charges might share, in a more realistic way, the largess of an innovated and techno-

---

[8] Henry M. Brickell, Organizing New York State for Educational Change, (Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1961), p. 18.

[9] Matthew B. Miles (ed.), Innovation In Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 3-4.

logically oriented society.[10]

Cass lends credence to the contention that much innovation is motivated by the interest of those outside education:

> ...the welfare of the child will be our primary concern. But his future is already being shaped, in large part, by agencies other than the traditional institutions of education--the teachers' colleges, the professional organizations, and the state departments of education.
>
> Increasingly the design of education's future is being drafted by pragmatic men who are bound neither by the heavy hand of tradition, nor by dogmatic educational philosophy. For them the measure of success is "what works". They are found in positions of influence in the federal bureaucracy, in private foundations, in the halls of Congress, in the new curriculum research centers, and in the vast new electronics and publishing combines. And they promise to add new, basic, and sometimes frightening dimensions to education's future.[11]

With the advent of such catalytic agents as Sputnik I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, long-held reluctance to change has given way to a new period. In short, we are in the midst of an unusual era born of unusual circumstances.

> Whereas change, innovation, and creativity may have been frighteningly dangerous concepts in the past, they have now become rallying cries and will continue to be so for the decade of the 1970's.[12]

---

[10] Maurine Hillson and Ronald T. Hyman, "Change and Innovation in Education: An Historical and Present-Day Perspective", Change and Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Organization (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), p. 2, Second Edition.

[11] Cass, op. cit., p. 69.

[12] Hillson and Hyman, op. cit., p. 3.

Need for the Study

The billions of dollars invested by the federal government in education through such programs as NDEA Title III, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 have spawned countless changes and innovations in secondary education in the United States. Investments by state governments and foundations have also played a major role. It might be fairly stated that the problem with innovations is not quantity but quality.[13] How can schools guard against the proliferation of meaningless innovations?

Such massive financial commitment to educational change deserves an accounting of the success of these innovations. It is a fact that a sizable number of educational innovations have been abandoned after successful and unsuccessful trials. A portion of Cawelti's study in 1966, the *National Inventory of Secondary School Innovation*, confirmed that some innovations were suffering relatively high abandonment rates.[14]

Glines has further emphasized the failure of innovations within recent years:

> What happens to innovative schools? Are the innovative schools of the sixties still innovating in the

---

[13] MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

[14] Gordon Cawelti, "Innovative Practices in High Schools: Who Does What--and Why--and How," *Nation's Schools*, LXXIX (April, 1967), pp. 64-66.

seventies? Generally not. Critics of massive change in education point to the fact that traditional accountability measures (math and reading achievement tests) have shown no substantial gains; thus as disillusionment in the community develops, the schools decide to return to a more conventional form. There are many other such considerations, but, for whatever reason, it does seem to be true that those schools which were considered to have lighthouse programs in the sixties have either reached a plateau and leveled off, or have retrenched. They are no longer rated a "must see" on the travel tours.[15]

Were such attempts to improve education founded on defensible bases, which offered promise for success, to deserve the financial support they received? Or, were many of them adopted without sufficient basis in educational theory and without adequate planning?

Sizer underscores the problem. He maintains that despite the vast numbers of new programs which have recently found their way into the schools, "no rigorous fresh theory of education has emerged". He further maintains that research on learning has been ignored or mocked. Practices are based upon what "feels right" rather than theoretical or empirical evidence.[16]

Only one major study of the extent of adoption of educational innovations, and the abandonment rate of such innovations, has been conducted and reported in the educational literature. During the fall of 1966, Cawelti conducted the National Inventory of Secondary School Innovation among 10,266 regionally accredited high schools in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and overseas Dependent's Schools. The study was co-sponsored by the North Central Association and the Institute for the Development of Educational Activity. Responses from 7,237 schools were used in the analysis.

---

[15] Don Glines, "Why Innovative Schools Don't Remain Innovative", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 370 (February, 1973), 1.

[16] Theodore R. Sizer, "Three Major Frustrations: Ruminations of a Retiring Dean", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 10 (June, 1972), pp. 632-635.

School administrators were asked to check the status of twenty-seven selected innovations in their schools. These innovations were divided into three groups: Curriculum (eight), Technology (seven), and Organization (twelve). Calwelti's study revealed that the national average rate of adoption of the twenty-seven innovations for all schools was 6.1. The average rate of abandonment of innovations was 1.7. The study did not propose to research the reasons why some innovations survived in practice while others had been abandoned.

Cawelti set an arbitrary level of a twenty-five percent adoption rate to distinguish between innovative and non-innovative practices. He considered a practice to be non-innovative if it was being used in twenty-five percent or more of responding schools.

For the purposes of this study the following items in Cawelti's instrument were eliminated because they were in wide use, having been adopted in considerably more than twenty-five percent of the responding schools: Chem Study

Chemistry, SMSG Mathematics, language laboratories, and student exchange programs. Honor study halls, CBA Chemistry and UICSM Mathematics used in Cawelti's instrument, were eliminated from this study because Cawelti found they had not been adopted in significant numbers of schools and were being abandoned by a large percentage of adopting schools in 1966.

Although PSSC Physics and team teaching were found by Cawelti to be in wide use, it was recommended by those advising on the development of the instrument for this study that these items be retained because of the wide national publicity given them. It was also advised that the thirteen additional items be included because they represent trends which have developed since Cawelti's study was completed.

Unfortunately, though there is a great deal of theorizing about change and a number of change strategies have been proposed, there is no generally accepted theory of change in education. Ward and Ivey emphasize that lacking an adequate theory, instruction, resource allocation, cost-effectiveness and evaluation are affected by unrelated changes.[17]

Chin states that we are without a theory of change and we thus feel a sense of urgency coupled with impotence because we lack a sense of destiny and its dynamics. Trying to bring about changes which we feel are necessary, we have no accepted method by which to accomplish such changes.[18]

---

[17] Ted W. Ward and John E. Ivey, Jr. "Improvement of Educational Practice," in Robert L. Ebel (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (Toronto: The MacMillian Co., 1969), Fourth Edition, p. 628.

Miles maintains that a large amount of empirical information on change has been accumulated but that there is no adequate theory of social change. He further states that increased clarity in our conceptualizations is needed to provide more intelligent control of change in education.[19]

Applebaum, in reviewing the contributions of theories of change based upon such concepts as evolution, homeostasis, conflict, and growth and decay, has stated that although such theories are in part convincing, they remain untestable.[20] On the other hand, Parsons has pessimistically predicted that a theory of change is unlikely to occur in our time and perhaps never.[21]

The implications of these statements are evident. With expenditures and effort for change continuing without the aid of a viable theory of change, we run the risk of adopting programs, some of which are ultimately successful, others which are not, and without ever really understanding why.

---

[18] Robert Chin, "Some Ideas on Changing," in Richard I. Miller (ed.) Perspectives on Educational Change (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 325.

[19] Miles, op. cit., p. 12.

[20] Richard P. Abblebaum, Theories of Social Change (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 136-137.

[21] Talcott Parsons and Neil J. Smelser, The Social System, (New York: Free Press, 1951), p. 534.

Since innovations in elementary and secondary education are continuing at a rather rapid pace, an identification of the pitfalls which contribute to their failure would be useful to educators in planning innovations in such a way as to avoid these hazards.

Research Questions

Evolving from the three major purposes of the study, the following specific research questions were developed for which specific answers were sought in this investigation:

1. Is school enrollment a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

2. Is the annual per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

3. Are the size and type of community in which the school is located factors in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

4. Is the type of school (public, private, parochial, government) a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

5. Which of the general classifications of innovations of curriculum, organization, and technology are more commonly found in the schools of the survey population?

6. Which of the general classifications of innovations of curriculum, organization, and technology are most frequently abandoned?

7. To what extent are finance, personnel, administration, pupil outcomes, or patron acceptance factors in the durability of an innovation?

8. Is the original impetus for the adoption of innovations a factor in abandonment?

Definition of Terms

Secondary School: A subdivision of a school system; public, parochial, private religious affiliated, private not religious affiliated, or government, composed of those grades above the junior high school, holding membership in the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Principal: The head building administrator of the public, private, parochial, and government schools included in the study. All were identified from the files of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Change: An alteration or variation in goals, structure or processes of a school which occurs between points in time.

Innovation: A species of change which is measurable, deliberate, specific, qualitatively different from existing forms and thought to be more effective in accomplishing the goals of the system.

Curriculum: The total offering of courses of study available to secondary students in the schools studied.

Organization: The systematic arrangement of structures to better facilitate the performance of functions of the school.

Technology: The application of scientific invention to the educational process.

PSSC Physics: A course or courses utilizing materials developed by the Physical Science Study Committee.

Harvard Physics: A course or courses utilizing materials developed by the Harvard University Physics Project.

ESCP Physical Science: A course or courses utilizing materials developed by the Earth Science Curriculum Project.

SSSP Physical Science: A course or courses utilizing materials developed by the Secondary School Science Project (Princeton) using Time, Space, Matter.

IPS Physical Science: A course or courses utilizing Introductory Physical Science materials.

Humanities Course: The provision of an elective or required course given for at least a semester's credit which combines instruction in art, music, literature, and philosophy.

Career Education: The provision of an over-all plan unifying all phases of the curriculum in occupational awareness or preparation.

Independent Study Programs: The provision of programs allowing students a segment of the school day free from regular class restraints to pursue in-depth study of a subject of the students' choosing.

Mini-Courses: The provision of an elective course taught and completed in 60 class hours or less.

Learning Packages: The individualization of the pace of learning by allowing students to work through packaged short units of instruction at their own rate.

HSGP Geography: A course or courses utilizing High School Geography Project materials.

IPI: The provision of individually prescribed instruction, through either commerically produced programs or programs developed by the school district or some related educational institution.

SRSS Sociology: A course or courses utilizing Sociological Resources for the Social Studies materials.

Ethnic Studies: The provision of an individual course or broad program of study of the history, heritage, and culture of one or more ethnic groups.

Television Instruction: The regular use of open or closed circuit television as a means of teaching courses for credit. (Includes cable television).

Programmed Instruction: The provision of a course designed for independent use in which students regularly use programmed materials (without a machine) so organized as to proceed in small steps, respond to information, and be informed immediately whether or not the responses are correct.

Teaching Machines: Regular use in classroom instruction devices which present educational programs designed to teach students through controlled communication.

Telephone Amplification: The provision whereby one or more classes periodically arrange to amplify telephone conversations dealing with information being studied in class.

Simulation or Gaming: The use of a device to create realistic political, social, or economic situations in class for helping students become involved in decision-making.

Data-Processing Equipment: The use of electronic accounting machines and computers for class scheduling, reporting marks, or attendance accounting.

Computer Assisted Instruction: The provision whereby one or more classes regularly uses a computer or computer terminal as an integral part of instruction.

Flexible Scheduling: The provision whereby the school operates on a variable schedule which starts with modules of less than 40 minutes in length and organizes the day into various combinations of these modules according to the different learning environments required.

Team Teaching: The provision of a course under the direction of two or more faculty members, all of whom participate directly in planning and meeting the class sessions.

College Credit Courses: The provision whereby high school students take Advance Placement courses and examinations, or a similar kind of arrangement, whereby credit is given for college level courses.

Non-Graded Programs: The provision whereby the student may pursue any course in which he is interested and has the ability to achieve, without regard to grade level or sequence; subjects are not divided into semesters and students progress on an individual basis.

Teacher Aides--Paraprofessionals: The use of degree or non-degree persons for assisting teachers in essentially non-teaching duties such as evaluating student compositions, supervising halls, or checking papers.

Differentiated Staffing: The provision for assigning teachers to differing levels of responsibility and classification utilizing special abilities and allowing for differences in compensation.

School-Within-A-School: An organizational design whereby a large secondary school is divided into smaller schools each having its own administration, guidance staff, building space, and students.

Cultural Enrichment Program: The provision of a regular program attempting to expose students to elements of society outside the school such as concerts, lectures, museums. This is intended as a regular program for given students, not just occasional field trips.

Optional Class Attendance: An attempt to encourage independent study by permitting students to have a choice as to whether or not they will attend class regularly.

Extended School Year: The total number of days in the school year (exclusive of summer sessions) is in the area of 200 days or more, or at least approximately two weeks in excess of what may be legally required.

Action Learning: Provision for placing students in the real world with adults on a paid or nonpaid basis in social service agencies, business, or industry.

Early Leaving Plan: Provision for students to complete graduation requirements and leave school in less than thirty-six months of attendance between grades 9 and 12.

Limitations of the Research

1. The study was limited to the member schools of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

2. The study of the adoption and abandonment of innovative practices was limited to the general categories of curriculum, organization, and technology.

3. The study of innovative practices was limited to thirty-three selected innovations.

4. The reasons for abandonment were included on a check-list and did not include all possible reasons. However, provision was made to allow for the inclusion of reasons not on the check-list.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

> Among the most conspicuous values in American culture of the twentieth century are progress, efficiency, science and rationality, achievement and success. These values have helped to produce a highly dynamic society--a society in which the predominant characteristic is change.[1]

> Nobody,...sews a patch of unshrunken cloth onto an old coat. If he does, the new patch tears away from the old and the hole is worse than ever. And nobody puts new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine bursts the skins, the wine is spilled and the skins are ruined. No, new wine must go into new wineskins.[2]

During the past ten to fifteen years, change and innovation have been watchwords in an educational movement associated with newness and discovery. Innovativeness is still found in education today and, in all likelihood, will be for the foreseeable future. There have been recent subtle changes. The glamour associated with change and innovation in the 60's has become somewhat threadbare in the wake of recent demands for accountability and fiscal conservatism in education.

---

[1] Floyd C. Mann and Franklin W. Neff, Managing Major Change in Organizations (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, 1961), p. 1.

[2] The New Testament in Modern English. Translated by J. B. Phillips (New York: The McMillian Company, 1962).

Have we passed the apex of change and innovation in education, or is the present period merely a respite from the frenetic immediate past? Are we entering a period of conservatism in education which will severely restrict the innovative educator, or will innovation proceed but only on the basis of strong justification? Will innovation flourish in some school districts and some regions of the country only to flounder and fail in others? The thrust of Carlson's study indicated that educators had experienced various degrees of failure and success in instituting change. Some changes had been slow to gain acceptance or were not accepted at all while others were readily accepted and on a rather wide-spread basis.[3] What are the reasons for this condition? Indeed, why are innovative practices abandoned?

Change Theory

Miles has indicated what may be one answer to the above questions:

> It seems fair to say that, while a substantial body of empirical information on change in social systems of various sizes has accumulated, there is no really adequate theory of social change.[4]

---

[3] Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965).

[4] Matthew B. Miles, Innovations in Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 12.

Lacking such a theory it is difficult, if not impossible, to predict with any degree of accuracy the success of efforts to change practices in education. Griffiths states that without a viable theory we expend effort, some of which results in success and some in failure and never really understand why.[5]

Ward and Ivey substantiate Miles' and Griffiths' arguments:

> If processes of social change can ever be orderly, those observed in current educational innovation must be described as disorderly. Lacking adequate theory, such vital elements as instruction, educational-resource deployment, and the associated cost-effectiveness relationships are affected by unrelated changes. Evaluation is inadequate to describe the effects, to say nothing of predicting consequences.[6]

Owens, in comparing change in education with that in agriculture, states that there are four basic reasons for the lack of change in schools:

1. Education lacks a precise knowledge base from which to plan change.
2. Education lacks "change agents" common to agriculture.
3. There is little or no monetary motive for change in education.
4. The school, being a "domesticated organization", is unable to choose its clients and the client's participation in the organization is not voluntary.[7]

---

[5] Daniel Griffiths, "What is Theory?", taped lecture.

[6] Ted W. Ward and John E. Ivey, Jr. "Improvement of Educational Practice", in Robert L. Ebel (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Toronto: The McMillian Co., 1969), p. 628.

[7] Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), pp. 145-148.

Ward and Ivey agree with Owens concerning the need for systematic, scientific approaches to change in education:

> One of the basic differences between the testing of a changed procedure in education and a change in either agriculture or medicine is the place where experimentation takes place. In fields which have well-developed laboratories for evaluation of a technique or material before it reaches the dissemination phase, an ill-advised change is brought to an appropriate end before it has either large-scale public notice or widespread practitioner involvement. Lacking a highly organized evaluative laboratory, education often puts the dissemination step ahead of the testing. Thus, innovations can lead to widespread, undesirable outcomes before data about their consequences are available; perhaps the fear of this possibility is one of the more important roots for educators' resistance to change.[8]

Strategies for change exist if accepted theory does not. MacKenzie has stated that "we do not have complete or adequate strategies but we do have greatly improved sources of insight."[9] What we do possess must be utilized if we are to make intelligent decisions concerning change. Precisely this lack of utilization of available information could be a reason for the failure of innovations in education. Pellegrin has given three reasons for the failure of research to significantly influence planning of educational improvement:

1. Research has failed to attack the problems which are seen by the practitioner as crucial.
2. The low quality and lack of sophistication of research has produced an output which cannot command the attention of the planner of change.

---

[8] Ward and Ivey, op. cit., p. 631.

[9] Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Why a Strategy for Planned Curricular Change?" in Marcella R. Lawler (ed.), Strategies for Planned Curricular Change (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 9

3. Planners of change possess a general ignorance of the worth of research.[10]

Ward and Ivey summarize the problem of trying to implement change without a viable theory or dependence upon research:

> Educational improvement continues to be a major challenge for educational research. In essence, innovation and other educational change has been a matter of treating symptoms. The current state is largely one of emphasis upon the activities of teachers without adequate reference to the outcomes or effects of those practices. Change, particularly innovation, has been largely a concern for tools rather than for processes and functions....Instructional techniques can easily get out of touch with the learning phenomena they purport to metitate....Piecemeal innovation must give way to a broader concept of change which begins with a specification of desired outcomes, moves to analyze characteristics and needs of students, and then to hypothesize and test experiences, environments, materials, and roles in terms of the achievement of the desired outcomes.[11]

Goldberg is in agreement with Ward and Ivey concerning the need for testing of innovations before large-scale adoption:

> Perhaps the true mark of an advanced and forward-looking school is not the length of its list of innovations in progress but rather the degree to which it continues to participate in the experimental testing of new ideas and postpones wholesale adoption until its own evidence becomes available.[12]

---

[10] Ronald J. Pellegrin, "The Place of Research in Planned Change," in Change Processes in the Public Schools (University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 65-75.

[11] Ward and Ivey, op. cit., p. 632.

[12] Miriam L. Goldberg, "Evaluation of Innovations," in Marcella K. Lawler (ed.), Strategies for Planned Curriculum Change (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), pp. 58-59.

Lionberger believes that change is best effected by giving attention to the process by which an innovation is introduced. For example, he suggests that "early work probably can best be directed to persuading a few people and rendering special assistance to insure their success." He further observes that "part of these initial efforts should be directed toward the creating of conditions that will facilitate change later on, rather than toward many early, quick adoptions."[13]

Rogers and Shoemaker have offered the following generalizations about cross-cultural innovations which have implications for educational change:

1. Innovations with a high rate of adoption have a low rate of discontinuance.
2. Earlier adopters have a more favorable attitude toward risk than later adopters.
3. Earlier adopters have more change agent contact than later adopters.
4. Earlier adopters are more likely to belong to systems with modern rather than traditional norms than are later adopters.
5. When the system's norms favor change, opinion leaders are more innovative; but when the norms are traditional, opinion leaders are not especially innovative.
6. Initiators of innovation decisions in a social system are unlikely to be the same individuals as the legitimizers.
7. The rate of adoption of an innovation is positively related to the degree to which the social system's

---

[13] Herbert F. Lionberger, "Strategy Implications for Planned Curricular Changes in Education: Inferences From Diffusion Research," in Marcella R. Lawler (ed.), _Strategies for Planned Curricular Change_ (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), pp. 81-98.

legitimizers are involved in the decision-making process.
8. Changes brought about by the authoritative approach are more likely to be discontinued than those brought about by the participative approach.[14]

In dealing with the concept of change, Griffiths derived the following propositions to explain change or the lack of change in an organization:

1. The major impetus for change in organizations is from the outside.
2. The degree and duration of change is directly proportional to the intensity of the stimulus from the supersystem.
3. Change in organizations is more probable if the successor to the chief administrator is from outside the organization than if he is from inside the organization.
4. When change in an organization does occur, it will tend to occur from the top down, not from the bottom up.
5. The number of innovations expected is inversely proportional to the tenure of the chief administrator.
6. The more hierarchial the structure of an organization, the less the possibility of change.
7. The more functional the dynamic interplay of subsystems, the less the change in an organization.[15]

Some Factors That Support Innovation

For many years Mort was the leading authority on educational change in this country. His main thesis was that the degree of financial support available to a school determined the extent of change observed over a significant period of time, and the system's receptiveness to innovation. Research by Mort and Cornell in Pennsylvania in 1936 established per-pupil expenditure as the most reliable predictor of acceptance of innovations.[16]

---

[14] Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1971), pp. 350-385.

[15] Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations" in Matthew B. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 431-435.

There is considerable support for this point of view. Bigelow found rapid diffusion of innovation in those communities of the Metropolitan School Study Council which had higher financial support in schools and high levels of parental education and occupation.[17] Miles states that the early studies found that community size and wealth appear to exert the most powerful effects in the case of "visible" innovations.[18] And Rajpal in his research at the University of Iowa in 1967 concluded that increases in pupil expenditures usually resulted in increases in a variety of quality characteristics of education such as high composite scores on ITED, higher qualification of teaching staff and positive and significant relationship with the total number of units in the senior high school curriculum.[19]

---

[16] Paul R. Mort and Francis G. Cornell, American Schools in Transition (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941).

[17] M. A. Bigelow, "Discovery and Diffusion in Pioneer Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947).

[18] Miles, op. cit., p. 640.

[19] Puran Lal Rajpal, "A Study of the Relationship Between Expenditure and Quality Characteristics of Education in Iowa Public Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967), pp. 117-123.

From the first however, Mort had his detractors. Grace and Moe learned that it is possible for school districts to have high per-pupil costs and still have inferior schools.[20] In addition, Swanson disputed Mort's contention that the relationship between change and financial support was linear. He maintained that the relationship was curvilinear and that there is an optimum point beyond which additional expenditures have no real effect on innovativeness.[21]

In Carlson's study of the pattern of adoption of "new math" in one West Virginia county, he found that the superintendent's position in the power structure of other superintendents was the chief factor in his district's willingness to accept innovations.[22] Per-pupil expenditure was only one factor. In commenting on Carlson's study, Owens has stated that per-pupil expenditure is probably not even a major factor in promoting innovativeness.[23]

Where finances are a factor in the adoption of innovations, the strategy by which money is spent may be more important than the amount of money spent per pupil.[24] An example is the diffusion of the Physical Science Study Committee program. Within ten years mass adoption of the program had taken place due to the development of a self-contained curriculum package, provision of grants and stipends for teachers to attend institutes on the program, and provision of matching funds to enable school systems to purchase the program.[25] The program was so effective that Jensen reported:

---

[20] A. G. Grace and G. A. Moe, State Aid and School Costs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938), p. 324.

[21] Austin D. Swanson, "The Cost-Quality Relationship," in The Challenge of Change in School Finance, Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on School Finance (Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1967), pp. 151-165.

[22] Carlson, op. cit., p. 63.

[23] Owens, op. cit., p. 143.

> PSSC Physics was in use in 50% of the college preparatory physics courses in our high schools by the fall of 1962, less than three years after its development.[26]

Aside from local effort in the area of financing education, one must also conclude that one of the major reasons for the interest in innovation in education in recent years has been the impact of federal aid to education through such legislation as the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Hillson and Hyman illustrate this contention:

> Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was specifically set up to underpin some of

---

[24] Owens, op. cit., p. 143.

[25] Paul E. Marsh, "The Physical Science Study Committee: A Case History of Nationwide Curriculum Development" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1963).

[26] Leroy Jensen, "Characteristics of Superintendents in Innovating and Non-Innovating School Systems and Interaction with the Iowa Department of Public Instruction" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967).

> of these innovative directions in education. Many of their documents refer to their philosophy of innovation. The magazine entitled PACE is an acronym for the words "Projects to Advance Creativity in Education." Various reports generally carried titles such as "Pace-setters in Innovation". Whereas change, innovation and creativity may have been frighteningly dangerous concepts in the past, they have now become rallying cries and will continue to be so for the decade of the 1970's.[27]

Carlson also illustrates the impact of federal interest in innovation in education:

> In addition...reference must be made to recent and large financial support for the change of educational practice flowing from the federal government through the Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and Title III of the National Defense Education Act. A greater emphasis has now been placed on innovation through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.[28]

In addition to federal support, foundations have played a significant role in the promotion of innovation in education. According to Miles, more than half of all moneys granted by the larger foundations go to educational enterprises.[29]

General public interest in education is more apparent now than ever, as evidenced by the outpouring of printed material on educational problems. Many national magazines such as _Time_, _Newsweek_, and _Saturday Review_ carry regular features or periodic supplements on education. The aphorism one often hears "Education is too important to be left to educators" underscores the widespread interest of the public at large. This interest has certainly brought about an examination of established practices and methods with a view toward updating them.

---

[27] Maurie Hillson and Ronald T. Hyman, Change and Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Organization (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971) pp. 2-3, Second Edition.

[28] Carlson, op. cit., p. 3.

[29] Miles, op. cit., p. 4.

Another factor influencing innovation in education is that we simply are learning more about the state of the art. As we better understand the teaching and learning process, change is stimulated. Hillson and Hyman illustrate this point:

> Why have we had such a confluence of innovative intensity that has literally moved us from an ebb and flow and sometimes moribund program of educational change to a vital arena of implementation and dialogue concerning the needs of educational innovation and change?...
>
> First, the scientific study of behavior and of learners--how they learn and the styles attendant upon that learning draw from the psycho-socio-anthropological context--has made a telling impact on educators. We know more about perception and learning, more about the intuitive forces that have to do with learning and the styles of learning, and more about the affective aspects related to learning, as well as the effective applications of what is learned, than we have ever known before. Second, the great resource of research on how to organize the setting for learning so we can capitalize on these findings is more readily available now than it has ever been before...Third, we now have and are continuing to create materials for instruction that are so excitingly original and superior compared to what we have had in the past, that not to get maximum value out of these materials by changing their context is almost a denial of our educational calling.[30]

---

[30] Hillson and Hyman, _op. cit._, p. 3.

When the decision has been made to adopt an innovation, the support of the decision-making power and the effectiveness of the innovation are two of the key factors to its success. This point is illustrated by Huberman:

> One of the most important factors...is the backing of whoever holds the main decision-making power in the educational system, be it a central authority, those who operate the system locally, or public opinion. But the most powerful factor of all is the rationality and acceptability of the innovation.[31]

Much of the impetus for acceptance of innovation can be explained through Miles' ten dimensions of organizational health. They help to explain the conditions often found in organizations which are receptive to change.

1. Clarity and acceptance of goals. In a healthy organization, members are reasonably clear about goals and their acceptability.
2. Adequacy of communication. Since the organizations are not simultaneous face-to-face systems like small groups, the movement of information within them becomes crucial.
3. Optimal power equalization. Subordinates can influence upwards, and can perceive that their superiors can do the same with their superiors.
4. Resource utilization. People have a sense of learning and developing while in the process of making their contribution to the organization.
5. Cohesiveness. The organization knows 'who it is'. Its members feel attracted to membership. They want to stay with the organization, be influenced by and have an influence on it.
6. Morale. The sense of well-being or satisfaction, as judged from individual sentiments or responses.
7. Innovativeness. A healthy system would tend to invent new procedures, move towards new goals, produce new kinds of products, diversify itself and become more rather than less differentiated over time.

---

[31] "No Blueprints for Innovation", London Times Educational Supplement, No. 3042 (September 14, 1973), p. 12.

8. Autonomy. A healthy organization is independent from the environment in the sense that it does not respond passively to demands from without, nor destructively or rebelliously to perceived demands.
9. Adaptation. The idea is that of being in realistic, effective contact with the organization's surroundings.
10. Problem-solving adequacy. The issue is not the presence or absence of problems, but the manner in which the person, group or organization copes with problems...they are solved with minimal energy; they stay solved; and the problem-solving mechanisms used are not weakened.[32]

Some Barriers to Innovation

The proposal of an innovation will meet with support and opposition in practically every school system. Lippit noted that change forces and resistance forces are both operating in almost every situation. While motives for this resistance vary, much of it is related to real or imagined threats to the security of the school's participants.[33]

Miles stated that any innovation which required important value changes in acceptors, such as those dealing with interpersonal relationships, race relations, and religious commitments, will encounter difficulty because much more than the innovation itself is involved.[34]

---

[32] Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health," in Change Processes in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1964), pp. 11-36.

[33] Ronald Lippit, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westly, The Dynamics of Planned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1958), p. 72.

[34] Matthew B. Miles, "Educational Innovation: Some Generalizations," Media and Educational Innovation (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1964), p. 243.

Willower postulated that when an innovation poses a real or imagined threat to the status of an individual it will often affect the acceptance of the innovation.[35]

Lippit says that resistance will develop when a proposed innovation tends to benefit one part of the system at the expense of others.[36]

Jensen states that the cost of the innovation may cause resistance from the administration or board of education.[37] Miles substantiates this claim: "On the face of it, it seems likely that innovations requiring inordinate outlays of money, energy, or time by the adopting person or group are likely to move slowly."[38]

Likert states that resistance to proposed innovations is likely when change is imposed by the administration.[39] In a similar vein, Jensen says that innovations are resisted because of the lack of information or knowledge concerning the proposed change.[40]

---

[35] Donald J. Willower, "Barriers to Change in Educational Organizations". Theory into Practice, 2: pp. 259-269 (December, 1963).

[36] Lippit, op. cit., p. 44.

[37] Jensen, op. cit., p. 64.

[38] Matthew B. Miles, Innovation in Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 635.

[39] Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1964), p. 246.

[40] Jensen, op. cit., pp. 64-65.

Carlson lists three major barriers to change:

1. The absence of a change agent, which he identifies as a person who attempts to influence the adoption decision in a direction he feels is desirable.
2. A weak knowledge base about new educational practices. Only in the past ten to fifteen years has any real effort gone into the establishment of research and development centers.
3. The "domestication" of public schools in which the school cannot select clients and the client cannot select the school, leads to a lack of interest in change on the part of the organization. The school is not in a competitive position with other schools and thus there is little stimulation for change.[41]

Carlson's final point is underscored by Thelen:

> Comparing classrooms now with classrooms of forty years ago, one notes that at both times there were numbers of students not much interested in what was being done, the typical teacher still presents material and quizzes the kids to see if they understand it; the amount of creativity and excitement is probably no greater now than then....The operation of the educational enterprise has encountered what only can be thought of as a very large number of increasingly serious obstacles and the new devices sustain the forlorn hope of protecting and maintaining rather than changing, the old orthodoxy in the face of the most important revolutions in the history of mankind.[42]

Dykes speculates that the root of the problem of resistance to change may be in the organization itself:

> All organizations possess built-in devices which tend to maintain stability. Acting as a gyroscope these devices seek to hold the organization in a steady state or to return it to stability when buffeted from within or without. This tendency toward stability,

---

[41] Richard O. Carlson and others, Change Processes in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965), pp. 4-7.

[42] Herbert A. Thelen, "New Practices on the Firing Line," Administrator's Notebook, XII, No. 5 (January, 1964).

> seemingly inherent in all organizations, constitutes a powerful force against change.[43]

Shane identifies abandonment of innovation as a major problem in education and says that abandonment is induced both from outside and within the school:

> One of education's unpublicized difficulties is a drop-out problem--a tendency for good ideas and innovations to drop out of sight before they have made a lasting difference in practice. In other words, while a number of good proposals for change and innovation have appeared in the past twenty years, they simply have not resulted in the kinds of major educational reformation that contemporary revolutionary social change demands.

He further suggests the following possible reasons for abandonment of innovation:

> The Community Environment
>
> At least six factors in the environment have worked against innovation in recent years:
>
> 1. A heretofore largely unsuspected lack of public support for educators' goals.
> 2. Once a grant has played out, a lack of public or institutional commitment to follow up on curriculum projects originally funded by foundations or by federal agencies.
> 3. During a period of continuing inflation, there is a conspicuous absence of enthusiasm for school tax increases to support innovations.
> 4. Since campus confrontations became commonplace in the mid-1960's, there has been resentment on the part of the "1-5" blue collar worker toward what he labels "...a generation of freeloaders who have chosen...to riot...rather than pursue the purely educational goals he never had an opportunity to achieve."

---

[43] Archie R. Dykes, "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," in Roy B. Allen and John Schmid, (eds.) Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration (Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, University of Arkansas and University Council of Educational Administration, 1966), p. 30.

5. As a carry-over from the 1950's a mistrust of contemporary educational methods. Bestor, Rickover, et al., have not been entirely forgotten.
6. A growing social and political conservatism. Conservatism, by definition, is status quo rather than change oriented.

The Internal Environment of the School

What does conjecture suggest about in-school forces that retard change? Several impediments come to mind:

1. Innovations sometimes create insecurity for teachers.
2. New programs frequently increase teacher load--at least temporarily.
3. Lack of sustained top-level leadership.
4. Every school of any size has disgruntled (and sometimes disturbed!) personnel.
5. Bruised by the dissent that may have surrounded past ventures initiated by local change agents, some teachers tend to be reluctant to participate in novel programs.
6. The impact of future shock--the arrival of tomorrow while many teachers were adjusting to yesterday--has unsettled many teachers.[44]

Eichholz and Rogers carried out an attitude survey of resistance on the part of teachers to new educational media. In their sample, eight types of rejection responses appeared:

1. Rejection through ignorance was assumed to exist when a given innovation was unknown or its complexity led to misunderstanding.
2. Rejection through default was expressed by admitting a knowledge of the innovation without any interest in its use.
3. Rejection by maintaining the status quo was expressed when the teacher did not accept an innovation because it had not been used in the past.
4. Rejection through societal mores was expressed when the teacher thought her society did not find an innovation acceptable, and therefore did not use it herself.

---

[44] Harold G. Shane, "The Drop-Out Problem in Educational Innovation," Educational Leadership, Vol. 30, No. 6 (March, 1973), pp. 507-512.

5. Rejection through interpersonal relationships was expressed by indicating that friends did not use an innovation.
6. Rejection through erroneous logic was expressed by giving "rational" or unfounded reasons for the rejection of a worthy innovation.
7. Rejection through substitution was expressed when a teacher spoke of using one practice over another that would have required the use of a particular innovation.
8. Rejection through fulfillment was expressed when a teacher was certain she knew the "best" and "only" way to teach, making any innovation completely unnecessary.[45]

Overcoming this resistance is a delicate task for the administrator. According to Huberman, most strategies concentrate on facilitating change by lowering resistance. The basic technique employed is that of introducing innovation by steps which are calculated to elicit the least amount of resistance and disruption.[46]

Why Are Innovations Abandoned?

Little has been written on the subject of the causes for failure of innovation in education. Eichholz and Rogers have illustrated this problem:

> Most of the 500-odd diffusion studies in all traditions mentioned have primarily been concerned with those individuals adopting innovations. Resistance

---

[45] Gerhard Eichholz and Everett M. Rogers, "Resistance to the Adoption of Audio-Visual Aids by Elementary School Teachers," in Matthew Miles (ed.), Innovation in Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 299-316.

[46] A. M. Huberman, Understanding Change in Education: An Introduction (Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 1973), p. 45.

or rejection of a given innovation has been mentioned only indirectly.[47]

In addressing himself to the innovation of modular scheduling, Sybouts states:

> A review of research which has been done on modular scheduling, as an example of changes in schools, points to a rather positive and successful pattern of results....The evaluation efforts in schools that have found modular scheduling less than desirable have been by contrast extremely limited or nonexistent.[48]

Sybouts' statement substantiates an earlier contention of Miles:

> Educational innovations are almost never evaluated on a systematic basis....
>
> To illustrate: it has been pointed out that less than half of one per cent of nationally financed experimental programs in a large state were systematically evaluated...and that reading instruction has not really been influenced by research findings for the past thirty years....
>
> Most educational decisions appear to be made in an intuitive, prudential manner. Sometimes the merits of an innovation are said to be "self-evident"....Informed student reactions and teacher responses are assessed; perceived student boredom is taken as an indicator of lack of learning, and the extra enthusiasm of teachers and students usually found in a new program is mistaken for the success of the innovation. Yet no hard data have been collected and decisions to terminate or continue the innovation are founded on sand.
>
> For these reasons, among others, many apparently promising innovations have been abandoned before they have a chance to "put down their roots" and apparently poor educational practices have persisted for decades.[49]

---

[47] Eichholz and Rogers, op. cit., p. 302.

[48] Ward Sybouts, "Change by Objectives," The Clearing House, Vol. 48, No. 2 (October, 1973).

[49] Miles, op. cit., p. 68.

An issue inseparable from evaluation is the matter of determining objectives for change. Sybouts expresses the opinion that much of the abandonment of innovation is directly traceable to the lack of linkage of these changes to pre-determined goals and objectives.[50]

Glines has listed some possibilities which might help to explain the failure of innovations within the past five to ten years. He suggests that the major reasons for failure are:

1. Pre-service college education and graduate training continue to produce the same type of obsolete programs and personnel.
2. Inservice training programs were not effective.
3. Many schools never really adopted substantive change in their initial conversion period.
4. On-going programs of change have not been provided.
5. The tendency of staffs to stop developing after a major innovation has been adopted.
6. Changes in social and economic conditions in a community.[51]

In one of the findings in a limited study of secondary schools in Indiana, Overly discovered that the primary reasons for the failure of innovations were:

1. Teacher opposition
2. Loss of funding
3. Lack of teacher preparation
4. Inadequate facilities
5. Administrative opposition[52]

---

[50] Sybouts, op. cit., p. 68.

[51] Don Glines, "Why Innovative Schools Don't Remain Innovative," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 370 (February, 1973), pp. 1-8.

[52] Donald E. Overly, "Comparative Analysis of North Central Accredited Indiana Secondary Schools in Relation to Educational Innovations," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968).

The impact of Title III ESEA on innovation in education was alluded to earlier. The programs under this act were to demonstrate innovative or exemplary educational practices designed to help meet identified local needs. Today, however, the act is close to extinction.

In a study of ESEA III programs, Norman and Balyeat have stated the following reasons for the failure of many innovative projects, which has brought out the present precarious position of the act:

1. The basic concept of ESEA III gradually changed from the original intent.
2. Evaluation problems developed because of a lack of a common national standard to use in judging the effectiveness of projects.
3. The ESEA III change model apparently failed to work as planned.
4. Time restrictions imposed on the projects were unrealistic.
5. There was a lack of training in change theory on the part of project administrators.
6. There was a lack of systematic training for project personnel.
7. There was a lack of understanding of the purposes of ESEA III on the part of many educators.
8. There was an unanticipated lack of imagination on the part of project planners.[53]

Pellegrin has listed eight conditions which in his opinion are responsible for the failure of innovations:

1. The serious confusion in education concerning sources of reliable and valid knowledge limit innovativeness.
2. In view of the complexity, size and scope of American education, the division of labor is inadequate for the specialized roles necessary for effective innovation.
3. Most training programs do not prepare the specialists needed to implement innovations properly.

---

[53] Douglas Norman and Ralph Balyeat, "Whither ESEA III?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 3 (November, 1973), pp. 190-192.

4. There is a lack of opportunity and resources to introduce innovations on an experimental basis and to evaluate them through research.
5. Many persons in education often conduct their work in isolation from the knowledge and specialized competencies of others.
6. There are grave weaknesses of channels and procedures for dissemination.
7. Educators are insulated from reality by ideological beliefs.
8. The difficulty of relating educational practices to the goals of the public contributes to the failure of innovations.[54]

Orlosky and Smith in their study of major change efforts have suggested that there are the following reasons for the success or failure of innovations:

1. Changes in methods of instruction are apparently more difficult to make successfully than changes in curriculum or administration.
2. Changes in instruction are most likely to come from within the profession.
3. A change that requires a teacher to abandon an existing practice and to displace it with a new practice risks defeat.
4. Successful changes in curriculum can originate either from within the profession or from without.
5. Curricular changes involving the addition of subjects are more permanent than those involving changes in the organization and structure of the curriculum.
6. The failure of curricular changes to be permanent may be attributed either to lack of social support or to resistance to displacement of the existing curriculum pattern.
7. Efforts to alter the total administrative structure are likely to be unsuccessful.
8. Changes that represent additions to the educational ladder are more likely to be lasting than changes that entail general modifications of the organization.
9. The lack of diffusion system will lead to abortive change.

---

[54] Roland J. Pellegrin, "An Analysis of Sources and Processes of Innovation in Education," (A paper presented to the Conference on Educational Change, Allerton Park, Illinois, February 28, 1966), pp. 18-20.

10. Changes that have the support of more than one critical element are more likely to succeed.
11. Changes will be resisted if they require educational personnel to relinquish power or if they cast doubt on educator roles.
12. If the cognitive load is light, i.e., if not too many people are required to learn too many new facts and procedures, the innovation is more likely to succeed.
13. The source of a change has less to do with permanence than the support the change receives.[55]

Watson believes that one of the reasons for the resistance to acceptance of innovation lies in the fact that once adopted, the innovation is often not subjected to systematic review. He proposes that resistance could be lessened and the chances of greater success could be increased if the project were kept open to revision and reconsideration.[56]

Hinkermeyer and Longenbach believe that the traditional reasons advanced for the lack of success of change and innovation--lack of finances, patron disapproval, lack of teacher cooperation, poor facilities--are not the real reasons for failure of innovations.

> The problem is people: those educators and citizens who resist change due to (1) incorrect and usually egocentric perceptions of their roles and to (2) a misunderstanding of the educational dynamics within a democratic society....

---

[55] Donald Orlosky and B. Othanel Smith, "Educational Change: Its Origins and Characteristics," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 7 (March, 1972), pp. 412-414.

[56] Goodwin Watson, "Resistance to Change" in Warren G. Bemis and others (ed.) The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 496-497, Second Edition.

> During the past decade, the American school system has also been the beneficiary of incredible financial aid. And yet, again incredibly, almost nothing has changed.[57]

Addis, however, disputes Hinkemeyer and Longenbach's first contention about the perception resisters to change have of themselves. He found no significant difference existing between the perceptions of principals of schools with a large number of innovations and those with a low number.[58]

Knedlik substantiates Addis' findings concerning principals and also concludes that the key person responsible for acceptance of or resistance to innovation is the superintendent.[59]

Another reason sometimes advanced for the lack of adoption or failure of innovation is that standards of state departments of education or regional accreditation agencies will not permit the necessary change. However, Armstrong's study has revealed that accreditation standards do not provide an insuperable barrier to change but, to the contrary, often actually encourage innovation.[60]

---

[57] Michael T. Hinkemeyer and Michael Longenbach, "The 'Turn-Off' How to Impede Change," The Clearing House, Vol. 47, No. 4 (December, 1972), p. 198.

[58] Winston Clark Addis, "An Analysis of the Perceptions of Principals of High and Low Innovative Schools, " (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968).

[59] Stanley M. Knedlik, "The Effect of Administrative Succession Patterns Upon Educational Innovation in Selected Secondary Schools," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967).

Frymer maintains that the causes of failure of innovations may be traced to the attitudes of personnel who are directly connected with the innovation. He further maintains that teacher and administrative resistance can be reduced by refusing admission to different entry points to those who are resistant to innovation.[61]

Hawkins found that the failure of innovation may have some connection with the size of the district. His study revealed that the optimum district size with respect to successful innovation was between 8,000 and 20,000 pupils. Districts smaller found it extremely difficult to effect innovation on multiple fronts. In systems much larger than 20,000 movement was slow due to the rigidity of the organization.[62]

Hardenbrook has suggested that the pattern of development for a particular innovation directly influences the scope and influence of the innovation. A precisely defined well-sequenced pattern of development determines in part the acceptance and survival of the innovation.[63]

---

[60] Robert Armstrong, "Do NCA Accreditation Standards Inhibit Innovation?" North Central Association Quarterly, (Fall, 1972), pp. 257-258.

[61] Jack R. Frymer, "Teachers: Not Will, But Can They Change", Strategies for Educational Change Newsletter, II (November, 1968), pp. 1-4.

[62] Wilbur D. Hawkins, "Some Factors Which Contribute to Successful Educational Innovation", (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968).

Allen stated that poor dissemination methods of knowledge about innovations contribute to their failure. He maintains that much of what we have so laboriously learned about educational theory and practice has been underadvertized, poorly packaged, and thinly distributed.[64]

Other suggested reasons for the failure of innovations have been advanced. Some of the shortcomings noted are:

> 1. So-called innovations...are plentiful, but little is known about the effects of different treatments or strategies of learning over a meaningful period.
> 2. Some innovations (e.g., certain new science and mathematics curricula, televised and programmed instruction, team teaching) suffer premature abandonment, often because of insufficient planning and lack of careful attention in early stages.
> 3. Schools often introduce changes in haphazard ways. They must begin to develop discrete goals, a system for continuous evaluation, and a willingness to acknowledge weakness in planning for change.[65]

Reichart has proposed that innovations often fail simply because the school is inundated with innovative proposals to the point that its participants simply don't know which to accept.

---

[63] Robert F. Hardenbrook, "Identification of Processes of Innovation in Selected Schools in Santa Barbara County", (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967).

[64] James E. Allen, "Strengthening Educational Research and Development," Remarks given at the Conference on American Education, National Network of Regional Education Laboratories, Washington, D.C., July, 1969.

[65] "The Innovation Rate is Speeding Up", Secondary Curriculum Letter, Vol. 9, No. 7 (March, 1970), pp. 2-3.

> The School is a workshop where there is no common language, no highly developed theories that relate to its activities, and no common scientific bases upon which to formulate directions. Hence, while the educational profession struggles for a definition of its terminology, its theories, its formations, the School stands resistant to replacements in its techniques, its attitudes, and its objectives. "How can we accept what you cannot decide on?" Although society is knocking at its doors with significant change, the School, having no voice of authority to listen to, remains devoted to its history of moving slowly before absorbing foreign elements into its midst.[66]

Carlson maintains that an educational innovation has a life cycle and a natural history. The life cycle includes its invention, development, promotion, adoption, diffusion, and demise.[67] Perhaps this is true. It may be that each innovation has within it the seeds of its own destruction. But why do some promising innovations never succeed on any large scale while other programs of comparatively little value continue? From what source do the more successful innovations emanate? What conditions bring on the demise of an innovation and what conditions insure its acceptance? Why does an innovation succeed in one locality but not in another? Why are innovations abandoned?

Summary

Most of the literature on the abandonment of innovations is rather piecemeal and is a matter of conjecture rather than the result of systematic research. The information we do have on abandonment from research is only incidental to the central purposes of the various studies noted. The critical need for further research on the subject is evident. Practically all research has dealt with the adoption of innovation with only indirect references to abandonment.

---

[66] Sandford Reichart, Change and the Teacher (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1969), p. 30.

[67] Carlson, op. cit., p. 4.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Population

The population for this study consisted of the responding schools accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The total number of responding schools was 3,476. Verification was obtained from the Secondary Commission of the North Central Association whose total membership of secondary schools was 3,711. Of the 3,476 responding schools, usable returns were received from 3,271.

Procedure

The design proposed for this research was a survey design involving written questionnaires supplied to principals of all schools in the survey population.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was developed which:

1. Described responding schools by enrollment, per pupil expenditure, source of support, and size of community where located.

2. Defined thirty-three current educational innovations included in the survey.

3. Established the date of adoption, extent of adoption, and current status of each of thirty-three selected educational innovations.

4. Identified the reasons given for abandonment of each of the thirty-three selected educational innovations which have been tried and discontinued.

5. Identified the impetus for adoption of each innovation reported abandoned.

The data were obtained from principals of North Central Association accredited secondary schools. The instrument was designed to ascertain in particular:

1. The enrollment of the school.

2. The per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes.

3. The type of school by support (public, parochial, or diocesan, private religious affiliated, private not religious affiliated, government, or other).

4. The type of area in which a majority of the students live (city of over 400,000 residents, communities ranging from 5,000 to 399,999 residents, suburban community, small town of under 5,000 persons, or rural area).

5. The adoption of thirty-three selected innovations.

6. The abandonment of thirty-three selected innovations.

7. The reasons stated by principals for the abandonment of thirty-three selected innovations.

8. The person(s) or organization(s) primarily responsible for the adoption of the abandoned innovation.

The survey instrument followed the basic design of the one used by Cawelti in his National Inventory of Secondary School Innovation in 1966. The format for the compilation of demographic information remained the same as that used in Cawelti's study. The format of Part B concerning the thirty-three innovations was also the same as that used in Cawelti's study. Twenty of the twenty-seven innovative practices in Cawelti's questionnaire were retained. The innovations included in this study were selected with the advice and consultation of the following persons:

1. The Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, University of Missouri-Columbia
2. Five Professors of Educational Administration, University of Missouri-Columbia
3. The Director of the Title III ESEA Project in the Cape Girardeau, Missouri, Public Schools
4. The Assistant Commissioner of Education for Missouri
5. The Executive Secretary of the Secondary Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
6. The Executive Secretary of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
7. Personnel of the National Institute of Education
8. Personnel of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development examined the questionnaire and ac-

cepted it in its final form.

Part C, Reasons for Abandonment of Innovation, included five general categories of reasons for abandonment:

1. Reasons Related to Financing the Program
2. Reasons Related to Personnel
3. Reasons Related to Administration
4. Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes
5. Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons

Included under these five general categories were thirty-five possible individual reasons for abandonment of the innovation. In addition, the respondent could include other reasons not on the list of thirty-five.

Following the completion of the reasons for the abandonment of the innovation, the respondents were asked to indicate the person(s) or organization(s) most responsible for the adoption of the abandoned innovation.

The instrument was field-tested in schools in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Analysis and Reporting of the Data

Survey data were analyzed and reported as follows:

Frequencies and percentages of responses were compiled and reported for Part A of the survey instrument, Description of Respondents; Part B, Status of Innovative Practices; and Part C, Reasons for Abandonment of Innovations.

Adoption and abandonment also were analyzed and reported by size of school, per pupil expenditure, source of support, and size of community. All data are presented in tabular or narrative form.

Because the size of the return of this total population study would render virtually any difference significant, descriptive statistics were deemed sufficient for the analysis of the data.

Second Questionnaire

Subsequent to the compilation of data from the first questionnaire, a second questionnaire was mailed to the 3,035 schools which reported adoption of at least one of the thirty-three innovations.

The second survey instrument:

1. Described the student population for which the innovation was designed.

2. Described the degree of implementation of innovations adopted by responding schools.

3. Determined how long each discontinued innovation had been in use before being abandoned.

4. Determined the source from which the innovation was developed.

5. Determined what modifications of the innovation, if any, had been made by the adopting school.

A total of 2,647 questionnaires were returned of which 2,469 were usable.

The data from the second questionnaire were also analyzed and reported by frequency counts and percentages.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data for this study were obtained by means of the questionnaire presented in Appendix A and mailed to each of the 3,711 member schools in the North Central Association of Schools. The data presented were derived from the 3,271 usable returns from a total return of 3,476 questionnaires -- a response of 94.7 per cent.

Description of Responding Schools

Each of the responding schools was described according to four characteristics: enrollment, per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes, source of support, and the type of community in which the school was located.

Responding Schools by Enrollment

As shown in Table I, the most commonly found enrollment interval in responding schools was 500-1,499. Only 998 or 30.5 per cent of the schools had enrollments of less than 500 pupils. There were 718 or 21.96 per cent of the schools which reported enrollments of 1,500 or more. It will be noted that 2,273 or 69.5 per cent of the responding schools had enrollments of 500 or more. Stanavage has pointed out that "despite the support for the importance of the human values inherent in small schools the drift towards larger concentrations of students continues...".[1]

TABLE I

RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY ENROLLMENT

Enrollment	f	%
Fewer than 200	159	4.9
200 - 499	839	25.6
500 - 1,499	1,555	47.6
1,500 - 2,499	563	17.2
2,500 -	155	4.7
Total	3,271	100.0

Responding Schools by Per-Pupil Expenditure

The data in Table II indicate that 58 per cent of responding schools maintained a level of expenditure for instructional purposes of $800 or more. Only 5.6 per cent reported expenditures of less than $500, with the most commonly reported interval of expenditure being $800-$1,500 per pupil. Ninety-four schools, or 2.9 per cent of those responding reported expenditures of over $1,500.

---

[1] John Stanavage, "Trends in N.C.A. Schools", The North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Summer, 1973), p. 212.

TABLE II

RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY ANNUAL PER-PUPIL EXPENDITURE FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES

Per Pupil Expenditure	f	%
Less than $500	183	5.6
$500 - $799	1,193	36.4
$800 -$1,500	1,801	55.1
Over $1,500	94	2.9
Total	3,271	100.0

According to Stanavage, 29.4 per cent of North Central Association schools are now spending $1,000 or more per pupil for instructional purposes, with the median expenditure being approximately $825. In addition, the number of schools spending less than $500 per pupil has steadily decreased over the past four years.[2]

Responding Schools by Source of Support

The North Central Association accredits public, parochial, private, and American Dependent's schools operated by the federal government. Of the schools responding only 9.6 per cent were non-public schools. Data for the total membership of secondary schools in N. C. A. indicates a steady decrease in non-public membership over the past four years.[3]

---

[2] John Stanavage, "Trends in N.C.A. Schools", *The North Central Association Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Summer, 1974), p. 233.

TABLE III

RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY SOURCE OF SUPPORT

Source of Support	f	%
Public	2,957	90.4
Parochial or Diocesan	117	3.6
Private, Religious Affiliated	131	4.0
Private, Not Religious Affiliated	22	0.7
Government, Other	44	1.3
Total	3,271	100.0

The data in Table III indicate that only 9.6 per cent of the secondary schools holding membership in the North Central Association are non-public schools. Of these, 7.6 per cent are schools with some connection with religious organizations with 2.0 per cent being government schools or not affiliated with religious organizations.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

Responding Schools by Type of Community

Table IV describes responding schools by the type of community in which the school is located. Of the total number of responding schools, 1,165 or 35.6 per cent were located in rural areas or in small towns of under 5,000 residents.

TABLE IV

RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH THE SCHOOL IS LOCATED

Type of Community	f	%
City of over 400,000 residents	267	8.2
Community of 300,000 - 399,999 (Not suburban)	49	1.5
Community of 200,000 - 299,999 (Not suburban)	41	1.3
Community of 100,000 - 199,999 (Not suburban)	125	3.8
Community of 5,000 - 99,999 (Not suburban)	940	28.7
Suburban-within Urban Fringe of Central City	684	20.9
Small Town of under 5,000	748	22.8
Rural	417	12.8
Total	3,271	100.0

The largest single group of member schools were found in communities of 5,000 to 99,999. Of the total number of responding schools, 1,166 or 35.7 per cent were located in suburban areas or cities with populations of 100,000 or more. North Central schools, it will be noted, are located mainly in communities other than small towns or rural areas with 64.4 per cent located in suburban communities and communities ranging from 5,000 to over 400,000 residents.

General Status of Innovations in the Responding Schools in the Study

The data in Table V describe the status of the thirty-three selected innovations in all the responding schools. The average number of innovations reported abandoned was 0.76 per cent or less than half that reported in Cawelti's study. The largest number of innovations abandoned after trial by an individual school was eight. Innovations showing a rather high degree of abandonment were: team teaching in 11.9 per cent of responding schools; PSSC Physics, 9.3 per cent; humanities courses, 6.5 per cent; flexible scheduling, 4.5 per cent; programmed instruction, 4.2 per cent. Of these, team teaching had been adopted by 64.6 per cent of the responding schools. PSSC Physics, which has been the subject of several studies because of the rapid rate of adoption nation-wide (50 per cent of all college preparatory programs within three years), was reported as having been adopted by 37.5 per cent of N. C. A. schools responding. Similarly, humanities courses, while showing a high degree of abandonment had been adopted by 39.9 per cent of the reporting schools. Flexible scheduling, which was reported as abandoned by 4.5 per cent of the schools had been adopted by only 18.4 per cent. Conversely, teacher aides and paraprofessionals suffered a rather high degree of abandonment of 3.2 per cent of responding schools after having been adopted by 61.7 per cent of the schools.

The most durable innovation reported was simulation and gaming which had been adopted by 2,102 of the responding schools and abandoned by only eighteen. Other innovations showing high adoption and low abandonment were: early leaving plan, action learning, and career education. Least popular was the extended school year which had been adopted by only 79 of the responding schools.

Of the thirty-three innovations in current use, either on a limited basis or fully implemented, an average of 9.7 were found in each of the schools. Seventy-one schools reported the extended school year in use, while 1,723 reported the use of team teaching which was the innovation reported most often adopted.

Most of the innovations whether still in use or abandoned, had been adopted in 1970 or later. Only 5.2 per cent had been adopted prior to 1965 and only 30 per cent were implemented between 1965 and 1969. Those innovations which were adopted by the majority of adopting schools between 1965 and 1969 were: PSSC Physics, ESCP Physical Science, humanities courses, and data processing equipment. Of the remaining twenty-nine innovations, all but two had been implemented by a majority of adopting schools in 1970 or later.

The following innovations, for the most part complex, expensive, or relatively difficult to staff and administer, showed a rather high degree of abandonment. These were: team teaching, PSSC Physics, humanities courses, flexible scheduling, programmed instruction, television instruction, data processing equipment, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, IPS Physical Science, mini-courses, and independent study programs.

Conversely, those innovations showing rather low abandonment, for the most part were less expensive, simpler, or easier to staff and administer. Examples of these were: ethnic studies, college credit courses, early leaving plans, simulation or gaming, optional class attendance, non-graded programs, career education, action learning, teaching machines, ESCP Physical Science, Harvard Physics, SSSP Physical Science, cultural enrichment programs, individual prescription of learning, SRSS Sociology, H.S.G.P. Geography, computer assisted instruction, telephone amplification, differentiated staffing, extended school year and learning packages. Of these, the following had also been adopted by a relatively large percentage of responding schools: simulation or gaming, action learning, early leaving plans, college credit courses, ethnic studies, cultural enrichment programs, career education, computer assisted instruction, and teaching machines.

The data on abandonment tend to group at 2.8 per cent of responding schools and above, and 2.1 per cent and below. Those innovations abandoned by 2.8 per cent of responding schools or more were: independent study programs, mini-courses, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, IPS Physical Science, data processing equipment, television instruction, programmed instruction, flexible scheduling, PSSC Physics, and team teaching. The remaining twenty-three innovations had been abandoned by 2.1 per cent or fewer of the responding schools. The lowest percentages of abandonment were: individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, and extended school year, 0.2 per cent; differentiated staffing, 0.3 per cent; H.S.G.P. Geography, 0.4 per cent; non-graded programs, 0.5 per cent; simulation or gaming, school-within-a-school, and early leaving plan, 0.6 per cent; and SSSP Physical Science, cultural enrichment programs, and action learning, 0.7 per cent.

For purposes of comparison with Cawelti's study, using his arbitrary figure of 25 per cent adoption, to distinguish between practices which were considered innovative and those adopted widely enough to no longer be considered innovations, the following from the thirty-three selected practices had been adopted by fewer than 25 per cent of the responding schools: Harvard Physics, ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, television instruction, teaching machines, telephone amplification, flexible scheduling,

TABLE V

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE SELECTED INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully imple-mented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	304	9.3	2,040	62.4	678	20.7	246	7.5	179	14.5	767	62.3	285	23.2
Harvard Physics	37	1.1	2,643	80.9	400	12.2	186	5.7	8	1.3	242	38.9	372	59.8
ESCP Physical Science	58	1.8	2,727	83.4	325	9.9	160	4.9	19	3.5	274	50.6	248	45.8
SSSP Physical Science	24	0.7	3,122	95.6	70	2.1	50	1.5	9	6.3	63	43.8	72	50.0
IPS Physical Science	105	3.2	2,222	68.0	732	22.4	208	6.4	28	2.7	348	33.2	671	64.1
Humanities	211	6.5	1,966	60.2	792	24.3	296	9.1	79	6.1	687	52.9	532	41.0
Career Education	18	0.6	1,568	48.0	607	18.6	1,071	32.8	55	3.2	143	8.4	1,496	88.3
Independent Study Programs	92	2.8	1,189	36.4	741	22.7	1,245	38.1	54	2.6	486	23.4	1,535	74.0
Mini-Courses	99	3.0	1,586	48.6	821	25.1	759	23.2	12	0.7	330	19.6	1,339	79.7
Learning Packages	67	2.1	1,825	55.9	353	10.8	1,020	31.2	27	1.9	218	15.1	1,194	83.0
HSGP Geography	14	0.4	3,014	92.3	132	4.0	104	3.2	13	5.2	83	33.2	154	61.6
IPI	8	0.2	2,788	85.4	126	3.9	343	10.5	9	1.9	47	9.9	419	88.2
SRSS Sociology	7	0.2	2,990	91.5	138	4.2	133	4.1	10	3.6	96	34.5	172	61.9
Ethnic Studies	60	1.8	1,911	58.4	771	23.6	528	16.1	16	1.2	206	15.2	1,135	83.6
Television Instruction	121	3.7	2,505	76.6	234	7.2	409	12.5	57	7.5	193	25.2	515	67.3
Programmed Instruction	138	4.2	2,113	64.7	234	7.2	782	24.0	80	6.9	281	24.3	796	68.8
Teaching Machines	59	1.8	2,577	78.8	209	6.4	426	13.0	55	7.9	206	29.7	433	62.4
Telephone Amplification	33	1.0	2,941	90.0	84	2.6	209	6.4	23	7.0	75	22.8	231	70.2
Simulation or Gaming	18	0.6	1,169	35.8	716	21.8	1,366	41.8	32	1.5	267	12.7	1,802	85.8
Data Processing Equipment	112	3.4	1,492	45.7	1,330	40.7	330	10.1	154	8.7	1,058	59.5	565	31.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	46	1.4	2,290	70.1	564	17.3	369	11.3	10	1.0	263	26.9	704	72.1
Flexible Scheduling	146	4.5	2,667	81.6	334	10.2	120	3.7	21	3.5	297	48.9	289	47.6
Team Teaching	389	11.9	1,157	35.4	669	20.5	1,054	32.2	152	7.2	903	42.8	1,056	50.0
College Credit Courses	60	1.8	1,880	57.5	706	21.6	662	19.0	160	11.5	326	23.4	905	65.1
Non-Graded Programs	15	0.5	2,649	81.0	206	6.3	400	12.2	18	2.9	105	16.9	500	80.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	106	3.2	1,250	38.2	1,022	31.2	892	27.3	69	3.4	921	45.6	1,029	51.0
Differentiated Staffing	9	0.3	2,872	87.8	153	4.7	237	7.2	32	8.0	78	19.5	289	72.4
School-Within-A-School	19	0.6	3,093	94.6	82	2.5	76	2.3	19	10.6	43	24.0	117	65.4
Cultural Enrichment Program	24	0.7	2,536	77.6	270	8.3	440	13.5	63	8.6	156	21.3	514	70.1
Optional Class Attendance	27	0.8	3,008	92.0	47	1.4	186	5.7	4	1.5	45	17.2	212	81.2
Extended School Year	8	0.2	3,191	97.6	48	1.5	23	0.7	7	8.9	17	21.5	55	69.6
Action Learning	24	0.7	1,403	42.9	1,087	33.3	753	23.0	194	10.4	489	26.2	1,184	63.4
Early Leaving Plan	19	0.6	1,358	41.5	1,148	35.1	744	22.8	97	5.1	514	26.9	1,300	68.0
Total	2,477	2.3	73,742	68.4	15,828	14.7	15,790	14.6	1,765	5.2	10,227	30.0	22,120	64.8

non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment program, optional class attendance and extended school year.

Abandonment of Innovations by Schools Reporting Adoption

An illustration of abandonment in relation to only those schools reporting adoption is included in Table VI.

Those innovations abandoned most often were: PSSC Physics, 24.8 per cent; flexible scheduling, 24.3 per cent; team teaching. 18.4 per cent; SSSP Physical Science, 16.7 per cent; humanities courses, 16.2 per cent; television instruction, 15.8 per cent; programmed instruction, 11.9 per cent; ESCP Physical Science and school-within-a-school plans, 10.7 per cent; optional class attendance, 10.4 per cent; telephone amplification, 10.1 per cent; and IPS Physical Science, 10.0 per cent. It will be noted that the majority of these innovations are relatively complex and in many cases expensive.

Those innovations reported abandoned by relatively few schools were: simulation or gaming, 0.9 per cent; early leaving plan and extended school year, 1.0 per cent; career education, 1.1 per cent; action learning, 1.3 per cent; individual prescription of instruction, 1.7 per cent; differential staffing, 2.3 per cent; non-graded programs, 2.4 per cent; SRSS Sociology, 2.5 per cent; cultural enrichment programs, 3.3 per cent; college credit courses, 4.3 per cent; ethnic studies and independent study programs, 4.4 per cent; learning packages and computer assisted instruction, 4.7 per cent; teacher aides - paraprofessionals, 5.2 per cent; HSGP Geography, 5.6 per cent; mini-courses and Harvard Physics, 5.9 per cent; data processing equipment, 6.3 per cent; and teaching machines, 8.5 per cent.

Among those innovations suffering highest abandonment the following had been adopted by a relatively large number of schools: PSSC Physics, 1,228 schools; team teaching, 2,112; humanities courses, 1,299; programmed instruction, 1,155; and IPS Physical Science, 1,045.

Other innovations suffered high abandonment though they had been adopted by relatively few schools. These included: flexible scheduling, 600; SSSP Physical Science, 144; television instruction, 764; ESCP Physical Science, 543; school-within-a-school plans, 177; optional class attendance, 260; and telephone amplification, 326.

Innovations widely adopted but abandoned by relatively few schools were: simulation and gaming, 2,100 schools; early leaving plan, 1,911; career education, 1,696; action learning, 1,864; college credit courses, 1,388; ethnic studies, 1,359; independent study programs, 2,078; learning packages, 1,440; teacher aides-paraprofessionals, 2,019; mini-courses, 1,679; and data processing equipment, 1,772.

TABLE VI

ABANDONMENT OF INNOVATIONS BY SCHOOLS REPORTING ADOPTION

Innovation	Adoption f	Abandonment f	as Percent of Adoption %
PSSC Physics	1,228	304	24.8
Harvard Physics	623	37	5.9
ESCP Physical Science	543	58	10.7
SSSP Physical Science	144	24	16.7
IPS Physical Science	1,045	105	10.0
Humanities Courses	1,299	211	16.2
Career Education	1,696	18	1.1
Independent Study Programs	2,078	92	4.4
Mini-Courses	1,679	99	5.9
Learning Packages	1,440	67	4.7
HSGP Geography	250	14	5.6
IPI	477	8	1.7
SRSS Sociology	278	7	2.5
Ethnic Studies	1,359	60	4.4
Television Instruction	764	121	15.8
Programmed Instruction	1,155	138	11.9
Teaching Machines	694	59	8.5
Telephone Amplification	326	33	10.1
Simulation or Gaming	2,100	18	0.9
Data Processing Equipment	1,772	112	6.3
Computer Assisted Instruction	979	46	4.7
Flexible Scheduling	600	146	24.3
Team Teaching	2,112	389	18.4
College Credit Courses	1,388	60	4.3
Non-Graded Programs	621	15	2.4
Teacher Aides or Paraprofessionals	2,019	106	5.2
Differentiated Staffing	399	9	2.3
School-Within-A-School	177	19	10.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	734	24	3.3
Optional Class Attendance	260	27	10.4
Extended School Year	79	8	1.0
Action Learning	1,864	24	1.3
Early Leaving Plan	1,911	19	1.0
Total	34,095	2,477	7.8

Status of Innovations by School Enrollment

Status of Innovations in Schools of Fewer than 200 Students

Table VII illustrates the status of each of the thirty-three selected innovations in member schools with enrollments of fewer than 200 students. The schools in this category reported the following innovations abandoned to the greatest degree: humanities courses, 7.6 per cent; PSSC Physics, 5.7 per cent; programmed instruction, 5.7 per cent; action learning, 5.0 per cent; IPS Physical Science, flexible scheduling, and team teaching, 4.4 per cent. Career education, H.S.G.P. Geography, SRSS Sociology, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, and extended school year were reported as having never been abandoned. However, the school-within-a-school plan and extended school year were reported as adopted by only one school each in this category.

Those innovations showing the greatest degree of current use either on a limited basis or implemented fully were: IPS Physical Science, 26.4 per cent of responding schools; action learning, 39.0 per cent; mini-courses and career education, 45.3 per cent; teacher aides or paraprofessionals, 46.6 per cent; independent study, 52.2 per cent; and simulation or gaming, 53.4 per cent.

The largest number of adoptions of the thirty-three innovations by schools in this category have taken place since 1970; 72.7 per cent of the adoptions had taken place between

TABLE VII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS OF FEWER THAN 200 PUPILS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	9	5.7	111	69.8	25	15.7	14	8.8	5	10.4	22	45.8	21	43.8
Harvard Physics	4	2.5	145	91.8	5	3.2	4	2.5	0	0.0	7	58.3	5	41.7
ESCP Physical Science	4	2.5	139	87.4	9	5.7	7	4.4	0	0.0	9	45.0	11	55.0
SSSP Physical Science	2	1.3	153	96.2	3	1.9	1	0.6	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
IPS Physical Science	7	4.4	110	69.2	34	21.4	8	5.0	1	2.1	16	33.3	31	64.6
Humanities	12	7.5	107	67.7	24	15.2	15	9.5	1	1.9	24	46.2	27	51.9
Career Education	0	0.0	87	54.7	25	15.7	47	29.6	5	6.9	5	6.9	62	86.1
Independent Study Programs	4	2.5	72	45.3	27	17.0	56	35.2	0	0.0	20	23.0	67	77.0
Mini-Courses	4	2.5	83	52.2	28	17.6	44	27.7	1	1.3	10	13.2	65	85.5
Learning Packages	6	3.8	104	65.4	12	7.5	37	23.3	1	1.8	6	10.9	48	87.3
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	151	95.0	2	1.3	6	3.8	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	87.5
IPI	1	0.6	141	88.7	2	1.3	15	9.4	1	5.6	2	11.1	15	83.3
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	145	91.2	6	3.8	8	5.0	1	7.1	4	28.6	9	64.3
Ethnic Studies	4	2.5	113	71.1	12	7.5	30	18.9	1	2.2	5	10.9	40	87.0
Television Instruction	4	2.5	132	83.5	7	4.4	15	9.5	2	7.7	8	30.8	16	61.5
Programmed Instruction	9	5.7	108	67.9	8	5.0	34	21.4	3	5.9	12	23.5	36	70.6
Teaching Machines	3	1.9	129	81.1	7	4.4	20	12.6	1	3.3	11	36.7	18	60.0
Telephone Amplification	2	1.3	153	96.2	0	0.0	4	2.5	0	0.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
Simulation or Gaming	1	0.6	73	45.9	19	11.9	66	41.5	1	1.2	7	8.1	78	90.7
Data Processing Equipment	6	3.8	146	91.8	2	1.3	5	3.1	1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2
Computer Assisted Instruction	1	0.6	150	94.3	6	3.8	2	1.3	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
Flexible Scheduling	7	4.4	128	80.5	16	10.1	8	5.0	0	0.0	16	51.6	15	48.4
Team Teaching	7	4.4	84	52.8	15	9.4	53	33.3	3	4.0	19	25.3	53	70.7
College Credit Courses	4	2.5	102	64.2	20	12.6	33	20.8	3	5.3	10	17.5	44	77.2
Non-Graded Programs	3	1.9	134	84.3	2	1.3	20	12.6	1	4.0	4	16.0	20	80.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	5	3.1	80	50.3	26	16.4	48	30.2	4	5.1	25	31.6	50	63.3
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	141	88.7	9	5.7	9	5.7	3	16.7	4	22.2	11	61.1
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	158	99.4	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	00.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	1	0.6	120	75.5	12	7.5	26	16.4	3	7.7	6	15.4	30	76.9
Optional Class Attendance	1	0.6	148	93.1	2	1.3	8	5.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	10	90.9
Extended School Year	0	0.0	158	99.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	00.0
Action Learning	8	5.0	89	56.0	26	16.4	36	22.6	1	1.4	19	27.1	50	71.4
Early Leaving Plan	2	1.3	107	67.3	14	8.8	36	22.6	1	1.9	7	13.5	44	84.6
Total	121	2.3	4,001	76.3	406	7.7	716	13.7	45	3.6	294	23.7	903	72.7

1970 and 1974. Only 3.6 per cent of the adoptions had taken place prior to 1965.

The responding schools in this category reported an average of 7.8 of the thirty-three innovations in current use either on a limited basis or fully implemented. Of this number an average of 4.5 were being tried on a limited basis. The average number of innovations reported abandoned after trial was 0.76 per school.

Status of Innovations in Schools of 200-499 Pupils

Schools with enrollments ranging from 200 to 499 pupils, included in Table VIII, reported the following innovations as most frequently abandoned: PSSC Physics and team teaching, 8.2 per cent; humanities courses, 5.4 per cent; and the use of data processing equipment, 4.3 per cent. No schools reported abandonment of the school-within-a-school plan, although only five reported adoption of the plan. Other innovations showing little abandonment were: differentiated staffing and extended school year, 0.1 per cent; HSGP Geography, optional class attendance, individual prescription of instruction, and SRSS Sociology, 0.2 per cent; SSSP Physical Science, 0.4 per cent; cultural enrichment program, 0.5 per cent; telephone amplification and simulation and gaming, 0.6 per cent; non-graded programs, 0.7 per cent; Harvard Physics, 0.8 per cent. Overall, twenty-two of the thirty-three innovations were reported abandoned by less than 2.0 per cent of the responding schools in this category.

Those innovations in greatest use currently either on a trial basis or fully implemented were: simulation or gaming, 55.9 per cent of responding schools in this category; independent study programs, 50.7 per cent; action learning, 49.4 per cent; career education, 47.6 per cent; teacher aides or para-professionals, 47.5 per cent; mini-courses, 46.0 per cent; and early leaving plans, 43.1 per cent. Of the schools reporting current use of one or more of the thirty-three innovations, those indicating use on a limited basis averaged 12.9 per cent of all responding schools in this category. Of the total of responding schools in this category, an average of 9.9 per cent reported full implementation of one or more of the innovations. On the average 8.1 of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by this classification of schools, with 4.3 being tried on a limited basis.

Those innovations showing little current use in responding schools either on a limited basis or fully implemented were: school-within-a-school, 0.6 per cent of responding schools in this category; extended school year, 1.4 per cent; SSSP Physical Science, 3.4 per cent; HSGP Geography, 5.3 per cent; optional class attendance, 5.5 per cent; SRSS Sociology, 6.1 per cent; telephone amplification, 6.4 per cent.

Of the responding schools in this category, 70.7 per cent reported adoption of one or more of the selected in-

TABLE VIII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS OF 200-499 PUPILS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	69	8.2	627	74.9	91	10.9	50	6.0	16	7.5	132	62.3	64	30.2
Harvard Physics	7	0.8	719	85.8	75	8.9	37	4.4	2	1.7	39	32.8	78	65.5
ESCP Physical Science	14	1.7	734	87.7	63	7.5	26	3.1	5	4.9	48	46.6	50	48.5
SSSP Physical Science	3	0.4	804	96.3	18	2.2	10	1.2	1	3.1	16	50.0	15	46.9
IPS Physical Science	25	3.0	594	71.1	163	19.5	54	6.5	9	3.7	80	32.9	154	63.4
Humanities	45	5.4	590	70.4	132	15.8	71	8.5	10	4.0	133	53.4	106	42.6
Career Education	8	1.0	431	51.4	128	15.3	271	32.3	4	1.0	40	9.9	362	89.2
Independent Study Programs	26	3.1	387	46.2	144	17.2	281	33.5	7	1.6	95	21.1	349	77.4
Mini-Courses	14	1.7	437	52.3	205	24.5	180	21.5	1	0.2	73	18.2	327	81.5
Learning Packages	19	2.3	486	58.1	85	10.2	247	29.5	7	2.0	50	14.2	294	83.8
HSGP Geography	2	0.2	792	94.5	24	2.9	20	2.4	5	10.9	16	34.8	25	54.3
IPI	2	0.2	735	87.7	28	3.3	73	8.7	1	1.0	9	8.8	92	90.2
SRSS Sociology	2	0.2	785	93.7	26	3.1	25	3.0	1	1.9	21	39.6	31	58.5
Ethnic Studies	13	1.6	594	71.0	105	12.5	125	14.9	6	2.5	29	11.9	208	85.6
Television Instruction	18	2.1	704	84.0	40	4.8	76	9.1	6	4.4	35	25.9	94	69.6
Programmed Instruction	27	3.2	586	70.0	51	6.1	173	20.7	16	6.3	59	23.4	177	70.2
Teaching Machines	12	1.4	681	81.3	49	5.8	96	11.5	11	7.0	50	31.8	96	61.1
Telephone Amplification	5	0.6	778	93.0	22	2.6	32	3.8	6	10.2	13	22.0	40	67.8
Simulation or Gaming	5	0.6	365	43.6	154	18.4	314	37.5	4	0.8	41	8.7	428	90.5
Data Processing Equipment	36	4.3	624	74.5	111	13.2	67	8.0	6	2.8	110	51.4	98	45.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	14	1.7	732	87.4	42	5.0	50	6.0	1	0.9	27	25.5	78	73.6
Flexible Scheduling	31	3.7	683	81.7	89	10.6	33	3.9	3	1.9	77	49.7	75	48.4
Team Teaching	69	8.2	460	55.0	84	10.0	224	26.8	8	2.1	141	37.4	228	60.5
College Credit Courses	9	1.1	596	71.1	85	10.1	148	17.7	11	4.5	39	16.1	192	79.3
Non-Graded Programs	6	0.7	705	84.2	38	4.5	88	10.5	3	2.3	18	13.6	111	84.1
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	28	3.3	411	49.2	183	21.9	214	25.6	8	1.9	170	39.9	248	58.2
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.1	748	89.3	34	4.1	55	6.6	7	7.8	13	14.4	70	77.8
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	832	99.4	2	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	4	0.5	682	81.5	62	7.4	89	10.6	17	10.9	26	16.7	113	72.4
Optional Class Attendance	2	0.2	790	94.3	9	1.1	37	4.4	0	0.0	7	14.6	41	85.4
Extended School Year	1	0.1	826	98.6	8	1.0	3	0.4	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
Action Learning	8	1.0	416	49.6	191	22.8	223	26.6	18	4.3	89	21.0	316	74.7
Early Leaving Plan	10	1.2	467	55.7	185	22.1	176	21.0	9	2.4	94	25.3	268	72.2
Total	535	1.9	20,801	75.3	2726	9.9	3,571	12.9	210	3.1	1,795	26.2	4,839	70.7

novations between 1970 and 1974. Those reporting adoption between 1965 and 1969 totaled 26.2 per cent with only 3.1 per cent reporting adoption prior to 1965.

Overall the 839 schools in this category reported an average abandonment after trial of the selected innovations of 0.64 per school. This represents a slightly lower degree of abandonment than that reported by schools with enrollments of fewer than 200 pupils.

Status of Innovations in Schools of 500-1,499 Pupils

As shown in Table IX, the largest number of responding schools were included in the enrollment range 500-1,499 pupils. Schools in this category reported the most frequently abandoned innovations, after trial, as: team teaching, 13.9 per cent; PSSC Physics, 8.9 per cent; humanities courses, 6.3 per cent; and flexible scheduling, 5.0 per cent. The above are the only innovations abandoned by 5.0 per cent or more of the responding schools in this category.

Several innovations showed rather satisfactory durability, with few schools reporting abandonment after trial. Among those reported abandoned by relatively few of the responding schools were: SRSS Sociology, non-graded programs, and extended school year, 0.2 per cent; individual prescription of instruction, differentiated staffing, and school-within-a-school, 0.3 per cent; career education, HSGP Geography, simulation or gaming, cultural enrichment programs, action learning, and early leaving plans, 0.5 per cent; Harvard Physics and SSSP Physical Science, 0.6 per cent;

optional class attendance, 0.8 per cent; and telephone amplification, 0.9 per cent.

Among those innovations in greatest use by the schools in this category, either as fully implemented or on a limited basis, were the following: learning packages, 40.3 per cent; mini-courses, 48.6 per cent; career education, 50.6 per cent; team teaching, 53.2 per cent; action learning, 53.4 per cent; data processing equipment, 56.3 per cent; teacher aides or para-professionals, 58.4 per cent; early leaving plan, 60.0 per cent; independent study programs, 61.8 per cent; and simulation or gaming, 64.1 per cent.

Innovations reported in rather limited current use either on a pilot basis or fully implemented were: extended school year, 2.5 per cent; SSSP Physical Science and school-within-a-school, 3.3 per cent; HSGP Geography, 6.4 per cent; optional class attendance, 6.8 per cent; SRSS Sociology, 7.8 per cent; and telephone amplification, 7.9 per cent.

On the average 10.2 of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by responding schools in this category. The number fully implemented (4.76) and tried on a limited basis (4.74) were almost evenly divided. On the average 66.0 per cent of the responding schools reported adoption of these innovations after 1970, with 29.7 reporting adoption between 1965 and 1969 and only 4.3 per cent reporting adoption prior to 1965.

The 1,555 schools in this category reported an average abandonment after trial of the selected innovations of 0.74

TABLE IX

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS OF 500-1,499 PUPILS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	138	8.9	988	63.5	322	20.7	107	6.9	75	13.2	359	63.3	133	23.5
Harvard Physics	10	0.6	1,288	82.9	171	11.0	84	5.4	1	0.4	98	37.0	166	62.6
ESCP Physical Science	21	1.4	1,319	84.8	143	9.2	72	4.6	7	3.0	129	55.1	98	41.9
SSSP Physical Science	10	0.6	1,492	96.0	33	2.1	19	1.2	5	8.2	27	44.3	29	47.5
IPS Physical Science	48	3.1	1,062	68.3	363	23.4	81	5.2	10	2.0	169	34.1	316	63.8
Humanities	97	6.3	989	63.7	337	21.7	129	8.3	32	5.7	285	50.7	245	43.6
Career Education	8	0.5	759	48.9	274	17.7	511	32.9	25	3.2	61	7.7	706	89.1
Independent Study Programs	41	2.6	553	35.6	352	22.7	608	39.1	27	2.7	222	22.2	752	75.1
Mini-Courses	48	3.1	751	48.4	399	25.7	355	22.9	5	0.6	161	20.0	637	79.3
Learning Packages	30	1.9	894	57.5	157	10.1	473	30.4	10	1.5	96	14.6	552	83.9
HSGP Geography	7	0.5	1,446	93.2	52	3.4	46	3.0	6	5.7	30	28.3	70	66.0
IPI	4	0.3	1,333	85.8	58	3.7	158	10.2	6	2.7	20	9.1	194	88.2
SRSS Sociology	3	0.2	1,428	92.0	67	4.3	55	3.5	5	4.0	43	34.4	77	61.6
Ethnic Studies	24	1.5	946	60.8	344	22.1	241	15.5	6	1.0	72	11.8	531	87.2
Television Instruction	60	3.9	1,184	76.2	111	7.1	199	12.8	26	7.0	91	24.6	253	68.4
Programmed Instruction	60	3.9	1,018	65.5	114	7.3	362	23.3	38	7.1	122	22.8	376	70.1
Teaching Machines	23	1.5	1,256	80.8	101	6.5	175	11.3	22	7.4	79	26.4	198	66.2
Telephone Amplification	14	0.9	1,416	91.2	32	2.1	90	5.8	7	5.1	30	21.9	100	73.0
Simulation or Gaming	8	0.5	550	35.4	348	22.4	648	41.7	14	1.4	120	11.9	872	86.7
Data Processing Equipment	56	3.6	623	40.1	700	45.1	174	11.2	47	5.1	556	59.8	327	35.2
Computer Assisted Instruction	18	1.2	1,103	71.0	238	15.3	194	12.5	2	0.4	108	24.0	340	75.6
Flexible Scheduling	78	5.0	1,250	80.5	168	10.8	57	3.7	8	2.6	157	51.3	141	46.1
Team Teaching	216	13.9	511	32.9	326	21.0	501	32.2	67	6.4	466	44.7	509	48.8
College Credit Courses	25	1.6	939	60.4	301	19.4	289	18.6	48	7.8	135	21.8	435	70.4
Non-Graded Programs	3	0.2	1,266	81.4	107	6.9	179	11.5	5	1.7	47	16.2	238	82.1
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	48	3.1	599	38.5	477	30.7	431	27.7	25	2.6	449	47.0	482	50.4
Differentiated Staffing	5	0.3	1,373	88.3	62	4.0	115	7.4	13	7.1	34	18.7	135	74.2
School-Within-A-School	5	0.3	1,499	96.4	26	1.7	25	1.6	5	8.8	13	22.8	39	68.4
Cultural Enrichment Program	8	0.5	1,229	79.0	115	7.4	203	13.1	20	6.2	75	23.1	230	70.8
Optional Class Attendance	13	0.8	1,434	92.3	24	1.5	82	5.3	3	2.5	24	20.2	92	77.3
Extended School Year	3	0.2	1,511	97.2	27	1.7	13	0.8	2	4.7	9	20.9	32	74.4
Action Learning	7	0.5	715	46.1	495	31.9	334	21.5	68	8.1	216	25.8	554	66.1
Early Leaving Plan	7	0.5	615	39.6	559	36.0	372	24.0	46	4.9	233	24.8	660	70.3
Total	1,146	2.2	35,339	68.9	7,403	14.4	7,382	14.4	686	4.3	4,736	29.7	10,519	66.0

per school. This degree of abandonment was approximately the same as that shown by schools with enrollments of fewer than 200 pupils.

Status of Innovations in Schools of 1,500-2,499 Pupils

Of the total responding schools, 563 were included in the enrollment range of 1,500-2,499 pupils. Schools in this category reported the following innovations showing a rather high degree of abandonment: flexible scheduling, 4.3 per cent; mini-courses and television instruction, 5.2 per cent; programmed instruction, 5.3 per cent; humanities courses, 8.0 per cent; PSSC Physics, 11.9 per cent; and team teaching, 14.2 per cent.

Table X illustrates that innovations reported abandoned least by responding schools in this category were: early leaving plan and individual prescription of instruction, 0.0 per cent; action learning and SRSS Sociology, 0.2 per cent; extended school year, differentiated staffing, non-graded programs and career education, 0.4 per cent; simulation or gaming, 0.5 per cent; and SSSP Physical Science and HSGP Geography, 0.7 per cent -- all less than 1.0 per cent.

The innovations in greatest use by the responding schools in this category, either as fully implemented or being used on a limited basis, were: PSSC Physics, 42.8 per cent; mini-courses, 49.4 per cent; humanities courses, 50.6 per cent; learning packages, 51.0 per cent; computer assisted instruction, 53.7 per cent; career education, 59.2 per cent; ethnic studies, 60.4 per cent; college credit courses, 61.7;

TABLE X

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS OF 1,500-2,499 PUPILS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	67	11.9	256	45.2	184	32.7	57	10.1	62	20.1	187	60.7	59	19.2
Harvard Physics	8	1.4	381	67.9	120	21.4	52	9.3	4	2.2	78	43.1	99	54.7
ESCP Physical Science	15	2.7	437	77.6	71	12.6	40	7.1	5	4.0	58	46.0	63	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	6	0.7	533	94.8	11	2.0	14	2.5	1	3.4	12	41.4	16	55.2
IPS Physical Science	17	3.0	372	66.1	128	22.7	46	8.2	6	3.2	55	28.9	129	67.9
Humanities	45	8.0	233	41.4	218	38.7	67	11.9	32	9.8	175	53.4	121	36.9
Career Education	2	0.4	227	40.5	135	24.1	197	35.1	13	3.9	31	9.3	290	86.8
Independent Study Programs	18	3.2	127	22.6	163	29.0	254	45.2	16	3.7	115	26.6	301	69.7
Mini-Courses	29	5.2	256	45.5	140	24.9	138	24.5	3	1.0	72	23.2	232	75.8
Learning Packages	11	2.0	264	47.1	74	13.2	212	37.8	5	1.7	54	18.2	238	80.1
HSGP Geography	4	0.7	489	87.2	45	8.0	23	4.1	1	1.4	30	41.7	41	56.9
IPI	0	0.0	450	80.4	28	5.0	82	14.6	1	0.9	11	10.1	97	89.0
SRSS Sociology	1	0.2	496	88.3	31	5.5	34	6.0	2	3.0	22	33.3	42	63.6
Ethnic Studies	13	2.3	210	37.3	233	41.4	107	19.0	3	0.9	68	19.4	280	79.8
Television Instruction	29	5.2	384	68.2	49	8.7	101	17.9	14	7.8	44	24.6	121	67.6
Programmed Instruction	30	5.3	315	56.0	50	8.9	167	29.7	18	7.3	67	27.0	163	65.7
Teaching Machines	12	2.1	404	71.8	44	7.8	103	18.3	11	6.9	52	32.7	96	60.4
Telephone Amplification	8	1.4	467	82.9	21	3.7	67	11.9	9	9.3	21	21.6	67	69.1
Simulation or Gaming	3	0.5	139	24.7	148	26.3	272	48.4	8	1.9	75	17.8	339	80.3
Data Processing Equipment	13	2.3	81	14.5	398	71.1	68	12.1	70	14.5	309	64.1	103	21.4
Computer Assisted Instruction	11	2.0	249	44.3	207	36.8	95	16.9	4	1.3	96	30.8	212	67.9
Flexible Scheduling	24	4.3	476	84.7	45	8.0	17	3.0	9	10.3	37	42.5	41	47.1
Team Teaching	80	14.2	79	14.0	183	32.5	221	39.3	53	11.0	220	45.5	211	43.6
College Credit Courses	18	3.2	197	35.1	222	39.6	124	22.1	65	17.9	111	30.5	188	51.6
Non-Graded Programs	2	0.4	425	75.5	45	8.0	91	16.2	7	5.0	30	21.6	102	73.4
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	20	3.6	137	24.3	243	43.2	163	29.0	20	4.7	210	49.3	196	46.0
Differentiated Staffing	2	0.4	472	83.8	42	7.5	47	8.3	7	7.7	23	25.3	61	67.0
School-Within-A-School	11	2.0	479	85.1	38	6.7	35	6.2	7	8.2	23	27.1	55	64.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	9	1.6	402	71.4	58	10.3	94	16.7	16	9.9	37	23.0	108	67.1
Optional Class Attendance	7	1.2	495	88.1	10	1.8	50	8.9	0	0.0	10	14.7	58	85.3
Extended School Year	2	0.4	545	96.8	9	1.6	7	1.2	1	5.6	3	16.7	14	77.8
Action Learning	1	0.2	144	25.6	298	52.9	120	21.3	75	18.1	127	30.3	216	51.6
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	126	22.4	308	54.7	129	22.9	26	6.0	149	34.2	261	59.9
Total	516	2.8	10,745	57.9	3,999	21.6	3,294	17.8	575	7.4	2,611	33.4	4,620	59.2

team teaching, 71.8 per cent; teacher aides and para-professionals, 72.2 per cent; independent study programs and action learning, 74.2 per cent; data processing equipment, 74.7 per cent; and early leaving plan, 77.6 per cent -- or 40 per cent or more of all responding schools in this category.

Those innovations reported in use by the fewest of the responding schools were: SSSP Physical Science, 4.5 per cent and extended school year, 2.8 per cent.

The average number of innovations reported in current use by the 563 schools in this enrollment category was 13.9 with the number fully implemented being 7.1 and 5.9 being tried on a limited basis. On the average 59.2 per cent of the responding schools reported adoption of these innovations after 1970, with 33.4 per cent reporting adoption between 1965 and 1969 and 7.4 per cent reporting adoption before 1965.

The schools in this category reported an average abandonment after trial of the thirty-three innovations of 0.92 per school. It will be noted that these schools reported both greater adoption and abandonment of the selected innovations than any of the the three previous categories of schools.

Status of Innovations in Schools of 2,500 Pupils or More

The responding schools enrolling 2,500 pupils or more, illustrated in Table XI, reported the largest percentage of participating schools experiencing abandonment of one or more of the thirty-three selected innovations. The innovations reported abandoned by more than 4.0 per cent of the responding schools were: Harvard Physics and IPS Physical Science, 5.2 per cent; teaching machines, 5.8 per cent; television instruction, 6.5 per cent; humanities courses, 7.1 per cent; programmed instruction, 7.7 per cent; team teaching, 10.3 per cent; and PSSC Physics, 13.6 per cent.

Several innovations showed a rather high degree of retention by the schools in this category. In all, sixteen were reported abandoned by fewer than 2.0 per cent of the responding schools: action learning, early leaving plan, non-graded programs, and career education, 0.0 per cent; differentiated staffing, learning packages, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, and simulation or gaming, 0.6 per cent; data processing equipment, 0.7 per cent; independent study programs, computer assisted instruction, extended school year, and cultural enrichment programs, 1.3 per cent; and school-within-a-school, 1.9 per cent.

Innovations which were in current use either fully implemented or on a limited basis by the largest number of responding schools were: IPS Physical Science, 40.0 per cent; PSSC Physics, 47.4 per cent; learning packages, 49.3 per cent; career education, 57.8 per cent; mini-courses, 58.7 per cent; humanities courses, 61.3 per cent; computer assisted instruction, 63.2 per cent; independent study programs, 65.2 per cent; ethnic studies, 65.8 per cent; college credit courses, 67.7 per cent; early leaving plan, 72.3 per

TABLE XI

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS OF OVER 2,500 PUPILS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	21	13.6	60	39.0	56	36.4	17	11.0	21	22.1	67	70.5	7	7.4
Harvard Physics	8	5.2	109	70.3	29	18.7	9	5.8	1	2.2	21	45.7	24	52.2
ESCP Physical Science	4	2.6	97	62.6	39	25.2	15	9.7	2	3.4	30	51.7	26	44.8
SSSP Physical Science	5	3.2	139	89.7	5	3.2	6	3.9	1	6.3	5	31.3	10	62.5
IPS Physical Science	8	5.2	85	54.8	43	27.7	19	12.3	2	2.9	28	40.0	40	57.1
Humanities	11	7.1	49	31.6	81	52.3	14	9.0	4	3.8	70	66.0	32	30.2
Career Education	0	0.0	65	42.2	45	29.2	44	28.6	8	9.0	6	6.7	75	84.3
Independent Study Programs	2	1.3	52	33.5	55	35.5	46	29.7	4	3.9	34	33.0	65	63.1
Mini-Courses	4	2.6	60	38.7	49	31.6	42	27.1	2	2.1	15	15.8	78	82.1
Learning Packages	1	0.6	77	50.0	25	16.2	51	33.1	4	5.1	12	15.4	62	79.5
HSGP Geography	1	0.6	136	87.7	9	5.8	9	5.8	1	5.6	6	33.3	11	61.1
IPI	1	0.6	129	83.2	10	6.5	15	9.7	0	0.0	5	19.2	21	80.8
SRSS Sociology	1	0.6	135	87.1	8	5.2	11	7.1	1	5.0	6	30.0	13	65.0
Ethnic Studies	6	3.9	47	30.3	77	49.7	25	16.1	0	0.0	32	29.6	76	70.4
Television Instruction	10	6.5	100	64.5	27	17.4	18	11.6	9	16.4	15	27.3	31	56.4
Programmed Instruction	12	7.7	85	54.8	11	7.1	47	30.3	5	7.1	21	30.0	44	62.9
Teaching Machines	9	5.8	106	68.4	8	5.2	32	20.6	10	20.4	14	28.6	25	51.0
Telephone Amplification	4	2.6	126	81.3	9	5.8	16	10.3	1	3.3	9	30.0	20	66.7
Simulation or Gaming	1	0.6	41	26.5	45	29.0	68	43.9	5	4.4	24	21.1	85	74.6
Data Processing Equipment	1	0.7	17	11.1	119	77.8	16	10.5	30	21.7	77	55.8	31	22.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	2	1.3	55	35.5	71	45.8	27	17.4	3	3.0	29	29.0	68	68.0
Flexible Scheduling	5	3.2	129	83.2	16	10.3	5	3.2	0	0.0	10	38.5	16	61.5
Team Teaching	16	10.3	23	14.8	61	39.4	55	35.5	21	15.9	57	43.2	54	40.9
College Credit Courses	4	2.6	46	29.7	78	50.3	27	17.4	33	30.3	30	27.5	46	42.2
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0	119	76.8	14	9.0	22	14.2	2	5.6	5	13.9	29	80.6
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	5	3.2	23	14.8	92	59.4	35	22.6	12	9.1	68	51.5	52	39.4
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.6	137	88.4	6	3.9	11	7.1	2	11.1	4	22.2	12	66.7
School-Within-A-School	3	1.9	124	80.0	16	10.3	12	7.7	7	22.6	6	19.4	18	58.1
Cultural Enrichment Program	2	1.3	102	65.8	23	14.8	28	18.1	7	13.5	12	23.1	33	63.5
Optional Class Attendance	4	2.6	141	91.0	2	1.3	8	5.2	1	7.1	3	21.4	10	71.4
Extended School Year	2	1.3	150	96.8	3	1.9	0	0.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	39	25.2	77	49.7	39	25.2	31	26.7	38	32.8	47	40.5
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	43	27.7	82	52.9	30	19.4	15	13.4	31	27.7	66	58.9
Total	154	3.0	2,846	55.7	1,291	25.3	819	16.0	248	10.9	791	34.9	1,228	54.2

cent; simulation or gaming, 72.9 per cent; team teaching and action learning, 74.9 per cent; teacher aides and para-professionals, 82 per cent; and data processing equipment, 88.3 per cent. The average number of innovations reported in use to some degree by responding schools was 14.6 with 8.3 fully implemented and 5.3 in use on a limited basis. This category of schools reported the adoption of the largest number of the thirty-three innovations per school.

The innovations reported in use by the fewest of the reporting schools in this enrollment classification were: SSSP Physical Science, 7.1 per cent; optional class attendance, 6.5 per cent; and extended school year, 1.9 per cent.

The schools in this category reported somewhat earlier adoption of innovations than schools in the other categories, with 10.9 per cent of responding schools indicating adoption prior to 1965, 34.9 per cent reporting adoption between 1965 and 1969, and 54.2 per cent reporting adoption after 1970.

The average number of innovations abandoned after use by responding schools was 0.99 -- the largest number of any of the categories of enrollment.

Status of Innovations by Per-Pupil Expenditures for Instructional Purposes

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of Less than $500

Tables XII - XV describe the status of the thirty-three selected innovations in responding N.C.A. schools by expenditures for instructional purposes. Table XII describes schools with expenditures of less than $500 per pupil.

Schools investing less than $500 per pupil per year for instruction reported the following innovations abandoned by a rather high degree of the schools in this category: humanities courses, 9.3 per cent; team teaching, 8.2 per cent; PSSC Physics, 6.6 per cent; and flexible scheduling and teacher aides and para-professionals, 5.5 per cent.

Innovations showing abandonment by relatively few of the schools in this category were: ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, telephone amplification, simulation and gaming, and differentiated staffing, 0.0 per cent; mini-courses, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, career education, optional class attendance, extended school year, and early leaving plan, 0.5 per cent; Harvard Physics, computer assisted instruction, college credit courses, school-within-a-school, and cultural enrichment programs, 1.1 per cent; and IPS Physical Science, learning packages, television instruction, and action learning, 1.6 per cent.

The most popular of the thirty-three innovations in current use in schools in this category were: independent study programs, 42.6 per cent; career education, 45.9 per cent; early leaving plan, 50.3 per cent; teacher aides and paraprofessionals, 51.4 per cent; simulation and gaming, 52.5 per cent; and action learning, 53.4 per cent.

TABLE XII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS WITH EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES OF LESS THAN $500 PER PUPIL

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	12	6.6	138	75.4	25	13.7	8	4.4	8	17.8	23	51.1	14	31.1
Harvard Physics	2	1.1	166	90.7	9	4.9	6	3.3	0	0.0	8	47.1	9	52.9
ESCP Physical Science	0	0.0	164	89.6	14	7.7	5	2.7	0	0.0	9	47.4	10	52.6
SSSP Physical Science	0	0.0	170	92.9	8	4.4	5	2.7	1	7.7	5	38.5	7	53.8
IPS Physical Science	3	1.6	131	72.0	42	23.1	6	3.3	1	2.0	17	33.3	33	64.7
Humanities	17	9.3	119	65.0	33	18.0	14	7.7	3	4.7	32	50.0	29	45.3
Career Education	1	0.5	98	53.6	39	21.3	45	24.6	3	3.5	9	10.6	73	85.9
Independent Study Programs	5	2.7	100	54.6	22	12.0	56	30.6	3	3.6	10	12.0	70	84.3
Mini-Courses	1	0.5	110	60.1	33	18.0	39	21.3	1	1.4	9	12.3	63	86.3
Learning Packages	3	1.6	122	66.7	15	8.2	43	23.5	3	4.9	8	13.1	50	82.0
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	170	92.9	7	3.8	6	3.3	2	14.3	4	28.6	8	57.1
IPI	1	0.5	164	89.6	9	4.9	9	4.9	1	5.3	2	10.5	16	84.2
SRSS Sociology	1	0.5	166	90.7	11	6.0	5	2.7	1	5.9	7	41.2	9	52.9
Ethnic Studies	4	2.2	120	65.6	31	16.9	28	15.3	1	1.6	6	9.5	56	88.9
Television Instruction	3	1.6	146	79.8	17	9.3	17	9.3	2	5.4	7	18.9	28	75.7
Programmed Instruction	6	3.3	135	73.8	14	7.7	28	15.3	2	4.2	13	27.1	33	68.8
Teaching Machines	7	3.8	142	77.6	13	7.1	21	11.5	4	9.8	12	29.3	25	61.0
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	169	92.3	4	2.2	10	5.5	2	14.3	3	21.4	9	64.3
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0	87	47.5	27	14.8	69	37.7	1	1.0	7	7.3	88	91.7
Data Processing Equipment	6	3.3	130	71.0	36	19.7	11	6.0	3	5.7	28	52.8	22	41.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	2	1.1	150	82.0	20	10.9	11	6.0	1	3.0	12	36.4	20	60.6
Flexible Scheduling	10	5.5	150	82.0	18	9.8	5	2.7	2	5.9	16	47.1	16	47.1
Team Teaching	15	8.2	100	54.6	33	18.0	35	19.1	3	3.6	32	38.6	48	57.8
College Credit Courses	2	1.1	113	61.7	33	18.0	35	19.1	4	5.7	9	12.9	57	81.4
Non-Graded Programs	3	1.6	155	84.7	11	6.0	14	7.7	3	10.7	4	14.3	21	75.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	10	5.5	79	43.2	40	21.9	54	29.5	3	2.9	44	42.3	57	54.8
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	161	88.0	8	4.4	14	7.7	1	4.5	3	13.6	18	81.8
School-Within-A-School	2	1.1	173	94.5	4	2.2	4	2.2	1	10.0	2	20.0	7	70.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	2	1.1	127	69.4	24	13.1	30	16.4	4	7.1	15	26.8	37	66.1
Optional Class Attendance	1	0.5	170	92.9	3	1.6	9	4.9	1	7.7	2	15.4	10	76.9
Extended School Year	1	0.5	174	95.1	8	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
Action Learning	3	1.6	84	45.9	44	24.0	52	28.4	10	10.1	18	18.2	71	71.7
Early Leaving Plan	1	0.5	90	49.2	52	28.4	40	21.9	6	6.5	24	25.8	63	67.7
Total	124	2.1	4,473	74.1	707	11.7	734	12.2	81	5.2	401	25.6	1,085	69.2

Less popular were the following innovations which were found in fewer than 10 per cent of the responding schools in this category of expenditures: school-within-a-school and extended school year, 4.4 per cent; optional class attendance, 6.5 per cent; SSSP Physical Science and HSGP Geography, 7.1 per cent; telephone amplification, 7.7 per cent; Harvard Physics, 8.2 per cent; SRSS Sociology, 8.7 per cent; and individual prescription of instruction, 9.8 per cent.

The average number of the thirty-three innovations reported in use to some degree in the 183 schools in this category was 7.87 with the number fully implemented being 3.86 and the number implemented on a limited basis 4.01.

Few of the innovations in this study were reported adopted prior to 1965. The schools in this category indicated that 5.2 per cent were adopted prior to 1965, 25.6 per cent between 1965 and 1969 and 69.2 per cent in 1970 or later.

The average number of innovations abandoned after trial by schools with expenditures for instructional purposes of less than $500 per student was 0.68 per school.

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of $500-$799

Of the responding schools 1,193 or 36.5 per cent had per-pupil expenditures for instructional purposes of $500-$799. The schools in this category, as shown in Table XIII, reported average abandonment after trial of the selected innovations, of 0.67 per school -- or only slightly less than that reported by schools with expenditures of under $500.

Those innovations reported as having been abandoned by the largest percentage of responding schools in this category were: team teaching, 11.0 per cent; PSSC Physics, 7.9 per cent; and humanities courses, 5.4 per cent. On the other hand, twenty-one innovations were reported abandoned by fewer than 2.0 per cent of the responding schools with sixteen reported abandoned by less than 1.0 per cent of the responding schools.

The innovations in most popular current use either fully implemented or being tried on a limited basis were the following: data processing equipment, 43.0 per cent; team teaching, 46.3 per cent; career education, 46.6 per cent; mini-courses, 47.8 per cent; action learning, 49.7 per cent; early leaving plan, 53.5 per cent; independent study programs, 53.7 per cent; and simulation and gaming and teacher aides and para-professionals, 54.8 per cent.

Among the innovations in least use were the following: extended school year in use only 2.5 per cent of the reporting schools; school-within-a-school, 3.1 per cent; SSSP Physical Science, 5.2 per cent; optional class attendance, 5.6 per cent; HSGP Geography, 6.7 per cent; telephone amplification, 7.4 per cent; and SRSS Sociology, 8.0 per cent.

The schools in this category indicated greater current use of the innovations in this study than were in use in schools with expenditures of less than $500 per pupil, with 9.2 being the average number in use to one degree or another.

TABLE XIII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS WITH EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES OF $500-$799 PER PUPIL

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully imple-mented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		Year Adopted 1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	94	7.9	836	70.1	196	16.4	66	5.5	45	12.6	224	62.9	87	24.4
Harvard Physics	10	0.8	1,022	85.9	105	8.8	53	4.5	3	1.8	58	34.3	108	63.9
ESCP Physical Science	11	0.9	1,039	87.2	94	7.9	48	4.0	3	2.0	72	47.4	77	50.7
SSSP Physical Science	6	0.5	1,144	96.1	25	2.1	15	1.3	3	6.7	19	42.2	23	51.1
IPS Physical Science	27	2.3	872	73.2	238	20.0	55	4.6	7	2.2	86	26.9	227	70.9
Humanities	64	5.4	773	65.0	247	20.8	106	8.9	24	5.8	223	53.6	169	40.6
Career Education	11	0.9	624	52.5	191	16.1	363	30.5	13	2.3	44	7.8	508	89.9
Independent Study Programs	42	3.5	510	42.8	232	19.5	407	34.2	10	1.5	147	21.6	525	77.0
Mini-Courses	37	3.1	585	49.1	298	25.0	271	22.8	5	0.8	126	20.8	476	78.4
Learning Packages	18	1.5	749	62.9	95	8.0	328	27.6	5	1.1	59	13.4	377	85.5
HSGP Geography	3	0.3	1,109	93.0	38	3.2	42	3.5	5	6.0	24	28.9	54	65.1
IPI	3	0.3	1,041	87.6	31	2.6	114	9.6	3	2.0	15	10.1	130	87.8
SRSS Sociology	4	0.3	1,092	91.7	51	4.3	44	3.7	5	5.1	39	39.4	55	55.6
Ethnic Studies	18	1.5	751	63.1	241	20.2	181	15.2	0	0.0	59	13.4	381	87.6
Television Instruction	41	3.4	941	79.0	77	6.5	132	11.1	27	10.8	54	21.7	168	67.5
Programmed Instruction	38	3.2	797	66.9	81	6.8	275	23.1	23	5.8	89	22.5	283	71.6
Teaching Machines	14	1.2	964	80.9	62	5.2	152	12.8	13	5.7	68	29.8	147	64.5
Telephone Amplification	12	1.0	1,091	91.6	29	2.4	59	5.0	8	8.0	20	20.0	72	72.0
Simulation or Gaming	10	0.8	529	44.4	214	18.0	438	36.8	5	0.8	73	11.0	585	88.2
Data Processing Equipment	46	3.9	633	53.1	401	33.7	111	9.3	31	5.6	335	60.0	192	34.4
Computer Assisted Instruction	21	1.8	939	78.8	128	10.7	104	8.7	1	0.4	68	27.0	183	72.6
Flexible Scheduling	40	3.4	991	83.2	113	9.5	47	3.9	5	2.5	87	42.9	111	54.7
Team Teaching	131	11.0	509	42.7	193	16.2	359	30.1	38	5.6	271	29.7	374	54.8
College Credit Courses	25	2.1	750	63.0	202	17.0	214	18.0	24	5.4	91	20.5	329	74.1
Non-Graded Programs	7	0.6	995	83.5	62	5.2	128	10.7	5	2.5	35	17.7	158	79.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	35	2.9	503	42.2	328	27.5	326	27.3	14	2.0	318	46.2	357	51.8
Differentiated Staffing	3	0.3	1,040	87.2	59	4.9	90	7.6	9	5.9	25	16.4	118	77.6
School-Within-A-School	1	0.1	1,154	96.8	19	1.6	18	1.5	2	5.0	6	15.0	32	80.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	7	0.6	946	79.4	82	6.9	157	13.2	14	5.7	40	16.3	191	78.0
Optional Class Attendance	11	0.9	1,112	93.5	13	1.1	53	4.5	0	0.0	10	12.8	68	87.2
Extended School Year	2	0.2	1,160	97.3	18	1.5	12	1.0	2	6.3	8	25.0	22	68.8
Action Learning	4	0.3	594	49.9	323	27.1	269	22.6	54	9.0	130	21.8	413	69.2
Early Leaving Plan	8	0.7	547	45.9	342	28.7	295	24.7	17	2.6	158	24.5	471	72.9
Total	804	2.0	28,342	72.1	4,828	12.3	5,332	13.6	423	3.9	3,081	28.1	7,471	68.1

Those in use on a fully implemented basis averaged 4.05 per school and the number being tried on a limited basis averaged 4.5 per school.

The innovations included in this study which had been adopted by responding schools in this category were implemented primarily after 1970 with only 32 per cent adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of $800-$1,500

Table XIV illustrates the status of the thirty-three selected innovations in schools with per-pupil expenditures for instructional purposes of $800-$1,500. This was the largest category with 1,801 of the responding schools included.

The schools in this category reported both a higher degree of adoption and abandonment of the thirty-three innovations than that reported by schools in either of the preceding expenditure categories of schools. On the average, 11.2 of the innovations had been adopted by the reporting schools. Of this number, an average of 10.4 were reported in current use.

Innovations which had been abandoned by a relatively large percentage of the schools in this category were: team teaching, 12.8 per cent; PSSC Physics, 10.5 per cent; humanities courses, 6.9 per cent; flexible scheduling, 5.0 per cent; programmed instruction, 4.9 per cent; television instruction, 4.1 per cent; and IPS Physical Science, 4.0

per cent.

Those innovations which were reported abandoned by relatively few of the schools in this category were: SRSS Sociology, 0.1 per cent; individual prescription of instruction, 0.2 per cent; non-graded programs, 0.2 per cent; career education, 0.3 per cent; simulation and gaming, 0.3 per cent; differentiated staffing, 0.3 per cent; extended school year, 0.3 per cent; early leaving plan, 0.5 per cent; HSGP Geography, 0.6 per cent; cultural enrichment programs, 0.7 per cent; optional class attendance, 0.8 per cent; action learning and SSSP Physical Science, 0.9 per cent.

A majority of the schools in this category had adopted the following innovations: career education, independent study programs, mini-courses, simulation or gaming, data processing equipment, team teaching, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, action learning, and early leaving plan. Of these, all were still in current use in a majority of reporting schools.

Generally the schools in this category tended toward earlier adoption of the innovations than those in the previous categories of per-pupil expenditure. On the average 63.3 per cent of the innovations were adopted in 1970 or later. This compares with an average of 69.2 for schools with expenditures of less than $500, and 68.1 per cent for schools with expenditures of $500-$799.

TABLE XIV

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS WITH EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES OF $800-$1,500 PER PUPIL

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		Year Adopted 1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	188	10.5	1,031	57.3	421	23.4	159	8.8	108	14.0	489	63.5	173	22.5
Harvard Physics	23	1.3	1,390	77.3	261	14.5	124	6.9	5	1.2	163	40.0	239	58.7
ESCP Physical Science	42	2.3	1,461	81.2	196	10.9	101	5.6	11	3.3	177	52.4	150	44.4
SSSP Physical Science	16	0.9	1,720	95.7	34	1.9	28	1.6	4	5.1	35	44.3	40	50.6
IPS Physical Science	72	4.0	1,166	64.8	423	23.5	138	7.7	18	2.8	226	35.5	392	61.6
Humanities	125	6.9	1,034	57.4	482	26.8	159	8.8	46	6.0	405	52.9	315	41.1
Career Education	6	0.3	801	44.5	351	19.5	640	35.6	32	3.2	87	8.7	876	88.0
Independent Study Programs	44	2.4	556	30.9	450	25.0	750	41.7	37	3.0	305	24.6	898	72.4
Mini-Courses	59	3.3	855	47.6	463	25.8	421	23.4	3	0.3	185	19.6	756	80.1
Learning Packages	45	2.5	910	50.6	226	12.6	617	34.3	15	1.7	143	16.2	727	82.1
HSGP Geography	11	0.6	1,656	92.3	78	4.3	50	2.8	5	3.6	51	37.0	82	59.4
IPI	4	0.2	1,509	83.9	78	4.3	208	11.6	4	1.4	28	9.7	256	88.9
SRSS Sociology	1	0.1	1,656	92.1	69	3.8	73	4.1	4	2.8	44	30.8	95	66.4
Ethnic Studies	34	1.9	1,008	56.0	461	25.6	298	16.5	13	1.6	125	15.8	653	82.6
Television Instruction	74	4.1	1,352	75.1	125	6.9	249	13.8	24	5.3	120	26.7	306	68.0
Programmed Instruction	88	4.9	1,135	63.1	130	7.2	446	24.8	49	7.4	166	25.0	449	67.6
Teaching Machines	35	1.9	1,410	78.3	123	6.8	233	12.9	33	8.4	117	29.9	241	61.6
Telephone Amplification	19	1.1	1,608	89.4	47	2.6	124	6.9	12	6.2	46	23.8	135	69.9
Simulation or Gaming	6	0.3	537	29.8	445	24.7	812	45.1	23	1.8	173	13.7	1,067	84.5
Data Processing Equipment	58	3.2	694	38.7	839	46.7	204	11.4	106	9.6	661	59.8	339	30.7
Computer Assisted Instruction	23	1.3	1,162	64.6	379	21.1	234	13.0	7	1.1	166	26.1	463	72.8
Flexible Scheduling	90	5.0	1,457	81.1	187	10.4	63	3.5	11	3.2	182	53.2	149	43.6
Team Teaching	231	12.8	533	29.6	415	23.1	620	34.5	95	7.5	575	45.5	595	47.0
College Credit Courses	33	1.8	992	55.1	422	23.5	352	19.6	112	13.9	206	25.5	489	60.6
Non-Graded Programs	3	0.2	1,426	79.2	127	7.1	244	13.6	9	2.4	61	16.3	305	81.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	61	3.4	637	35.4	609	33.9	492	27.3	48	4.1	530	45.6	585	50.3
Differentiated Staffing	6	0.3	1,597	88.7	77	4.3	121	6.7	18	8.8	46	22.5	140	68.6
School-Within-A-School	14	0.8	1,685	93.6	52	2.9	49	2.7	11	9.6	31	27.0	73	63.5
Cultural Enrichment Programs	13	0.7	1,409	78.2	145	8.1	234	13.0	39	10.0	91	23.3	261	66.8
Optional Class Attendance	14	0.8	1,642	91.2	28	1.6	117	6.5	3	1.9	33	20.8	123	77.4
Extended School Year	5	0.3	1,764	98.0	21	1.2	10	0.6	5	13.9	7	19.4	24	66.7
Action Learning	17	0.9	698	38.8	676	37.6	408	22.7	122	11.1	321	29.1	660	59.8
Early Leaving Plan	9	0.5	690	38.4	713	39.6	387	21.5	70	6.3	315	28.4	723	65.3
Total	1,469	2.5	39,181	66.0	9,554	16.1	9,165	15.4	1,102	5.5	6,310	31.3	12,779	63.3

Status of Innovations in Schools with Per-Pupil Expenditures of Over $1,500

The data in Table XV indicate that the degree of abandonment of innovations reported by schools with per-pupil expenditures of over $1,500 for instructional purposes was almost identical to that reported by schools with expenditures between $800 and $1,500. The average abandonment reported was 0.83 per school.

The innovations reported abandoned most often were: team teaching, 12.8 per cent; PSSC Physics, 10.8 per cent; programmed instruction, 6.4 per cent; humanities courses, 5.4 per cent; ESCP Physical Science, 5.3 per cent; flexible scheduling, 5.3 per cent; and ethnic studies, 4.3 per cent. It is interesting to note that, with the exception of ESCP Physical Science and flexible scheduling, all of the above innovations had been adopted by at least a majority of responding schools. Team teaching which had been abandoned by the largest number of schools had been adopted by 84.0 per cent of the responding schools.

Several innovations had suffered no abandonment at all, while being adopted by a majority of schools. Those reported as having been abandoned by none of the schools in this category were: career education, computer assisted instruction, teacher aides and para-professionals, early leaving plan, action learning, and college credit courses. Of these, action learning and college credit courses were reported as having been adopted by over 70.0 per cent of the schools.

TABLE XV

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS WITH EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES OF OVER $1,500 PER PUPIL

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	10	10.8	35	37.6	35	37.6	13	14.0	18	30.5	31	52.5	10	16.9
Harvard Physics	2	2.1	65	69.1	24	25.5	3	3.2	0	0.0	14	48.3	15	51.7
ESCP Physical Science	5	5.3	63	67.0	20	21.3	6	6.4	5	16.1	16	51.6	10	32.3
SSSP Physical Science	2	2.1	87	92.6	3	3.2	2	2.1	1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6
IPS Physical Science	3	3.2	54	57.4	29	30.9	8	8.5	2	5.1	19	48.7	18	46.2
Humanities	5	5.4	42	45.7	29	31.5	16	17.4	6	11.8	26	51.0	19	37.3
Career Education	0	0.0	45	47.9	26	27.7	23	24.5	7	14.3	3	6.1	39	79.6
Independent Study Programs	1	1.1	25	26.6	36	38.3	32	34.0	4	5.8	23	33.3	42	60.9
Mini-Courses	2	2.1	38	40.4	26	27.7	28	29.8	3	5.4	9	16.1	44	78.6
Learning Packages	1	1.1	44	46.8	17	18.1	32	34.0	4	7.7	8	15.4	40	76.9
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	79	84.0	9	9.6	6	6.4	1	6.7	4	26.7	10	66.7
IPI	0	0.0	74	78.7	8	8.5	12	12.8	1	5.0	2	10.0	17	85.0
SRSS Sociology	1	1.1	75	79.8	7	7.4	11	11.7	0	0.0	6	31.6	13	68.4
Ethnic Studies	4	4.3	32	34.0	38	40.4	20	21.3	2	3.2	16	25.8	44	71.0
Television Instruction	3	3.2	65	69.1	15	16.0	11	11.7	4	13.8	12	41.4	13	44.8
Programmed Instruction	6	6.4	45	47.9	9	9.6	34	36.2	6	12.0	13	26.0	31	62.0
Teaching Machines	3	3.2	60	63.8	11	11.7	20	21.3	5	14.7	9	26.5	20	58.8
Telephone Amplification	2	2.1	72	76.6	4	4.3	16	17.0	1	4.5	6	27.3	15	68.2
Simulation or Gaming	2	2.1	16	17.0	28	29.8	48	51.1	3	3.8	14	17.9	61	78.2
Data Processing Equipment	2	2.1	34	36.2	54	57.4	4	4.3	14	23.3	34	56.7	12	20.0
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0	39	41.5	37	39.4	18	19.1	1	1.8	17	30.9	37	67.3
Flexible Scheduling	5	5.3	68	72.3	16	17.0	5	5.3	2	7.7	11	42.3	13	50.0
Team Teaching	12	12.8	15	16.0	27	28.7	40	42.6	15	19.0	25	31.6	39	49.4
College Credit Courses	0	0.0	24	25.5	49	52.1	21	22.3	20	28.6	20	28.6	30	42.9
Non-Graded Programs	2	2.1	73	77.7	6	6.4	13	13.8	1	4.8	5	23.8	15	71.4
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	0	0.0	30	31.9	44	46.8	20	21.3	4	6.3	30	46.9	30	46.9
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	73	77.7	9	9.6	12	12.8	4	19.0	4	19.0	13	61.9
School-Within-A-School	2	2.1	80	85.1	7	7.4	5	5.3	5	35.7	4	28.6	5	35.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	2	2.2	53	57.0	19	20.4	19	20.4	6	14.6	10	24.4	25	61.0
Optional Class Attendance	1	1.1	83	88.3	3	3.2	7	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	92	97.9	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	27	28.7	43	45.7	24	25.5	8	11.9	19	28.4	40	59.7
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	31	33.0	41	43.6	22	23.4	4	6.3	17	27.0	42	66.7
Total	78	2.5	1,738	56.1	730	23.6	552	17.8	157	11.5	432	31.6	776	56.8

On the average, 14.5 of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by the ninety-four schools in this category, the highest average adoption of all categories of per-pupil expenditure.

Overall, sixteen of the thirty-three innovations were reported as having been adopted by a majority of the responding schools. Team teaching which had been abandoned by 12.8 per cent of the schools had been adopted by 84.0 per cent. The most durable innovation was simulation and gaming which had been adopted by 80.9 per cent of the schools while being abandoned by 2.1 per cent.

The schools in this category reported earlier and more widespread adoption of innovations than any of the schools in the other categories of expenditure, and tended to support Cawelti's finding that greater innovation was found in schools with higher levels of per-pupil expenditures. Reports by schools indicated an average of 43.1 per cent of innovations adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations by Source of Support of School

Tables XVI - XX illustrate the status of innovations by source of support. Of the five categories of source of support, public schools reported the lowest degree of abandonment. However, these schools also reported a lower degree of adoption, indicating that non-public schools may tend to attempt a greater number of innovations even though they may experience greater difficulty in maintaining them.

Status of Innovations in Public Schools

The data in Table XVI indicate an average abandonment of .72 innovations per public school. The innovations reported most frequently abandoned by public schools were: team teaching, abandoned by 12 per cent; PSSC Physics, 8.5 per cent; humanities courses, 6.1 per cent; flexible scheduling and programmed instruction, 4.2 per cent; television instruction, 3.7 per cent; and teacher aides and para-professionals, 3.5 per cent.

Those innovations abandoned by relatively few public schools were: Harvard Physics, SSSP Physical Science, career education, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, simulation or gaming, non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment programs, optional class attendance, extended school year, action learning, and early leaving plans, all of which were reported abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of the responding public schools.

An average of 10.2 innovations were reported as having been adopted by public schools, with an average of 9.5 in current use. Nine innovations were reported to have been adopted by a majority of schools; these were: mini-courses, 50.2 per cent; career education, 53.6 per cent; data processing equipment, 54.8 per cent; action learning, 57.5 per cent; early leaving plan, 58.5 per cent; independent study programs, 62 per cent; teacher aides and para-professionals,

TABLE XVI

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	252	8.5	1,907	64.6	579	19.6	216	7.3	150	14.3	661	63.0	239	22.8
Harvard Physics	26	0.9	2,403	81.4	356	12.1	168	5.7	7	1.3	219	39.8	324	58.9
ESCP Physical Science	48	1.6	2,460	83.2	299	10.1	149	5.0	17	3.4	251	50.8	226	45.7
SSSP Physical Science	20	0.7	2,824	95.7	63	2.1	45	1.5	8	6.2	56	43.4	65	50.4
IPS Physical Science	77	2.6	1,065	69.9	628	21.3	184	6.2	24	2.7	286	32.1	581	65.2
Humanities	179	6.1	1,819	61.6	709	24.0	247	8.4	74	6.5	613	54.1	446	39.4
Career Education	17	0.6	1,369	46.4	571	19.3	994	33.7	47	3.0	135	8.5	1,399	88.5
Independent Study Programs	82	2.8	1,123	38.0	664	22.5	1,086	36.8	53	2.9	434	23.7	1,342	73.4
Mini-Courses	87	2.9	1,471	49.8	736	24.9	659	22.3	10	0.7	293	19.7	1,181	79.6
Learning Packages	58	2.0	1,685	57.0	305	10.3	906	30.7	24	1.9	197	15.6	1,045	82.5
HSGP Geography	13	0.4	2,721	92.2	122	4.1	95	3.2	12	5.2	80	34.8	138	60.0
IPI	8	0.3	2,528	85.6	117	4.0	300	10.2	8	1.9	44	10.4	371	87.7
SRSS Sociology	4	0.1	2,711	91.8	121	4.1	118	4.0	10	4.1	79	32.5	154	63.4
Ethnic Studies	44	1.5	1,788	60.5	685	23.2	439	14.9	8	0.7	181	15.5	977	83.8
Television Instruction	108	3.7	2,254	76.3	221	7.5	373	12.6	49	7.0	176	25.0	478	68.0
Programmed Instruction	123	4.2	1,942	65.7	213	7.2	676	22.9	73	7.2	251	24.8	690	68.0
Teaching Machines	55	1.9	2,332	78.9	192	6.5	378	12.8	48	7.7	190	30.4	387	61.9
Telephone Amplification	33	1.1	2,638	89.3	79	2.7	203	6.9	22	6.9	73	23.0	223	70.1
Simulation or Gaming	14	0.5	1,086	36.8	640	21.7	1,215	41.1	28	1.5	246	13.2	1,396	85.3
Data Processing Equipment	87	2.9	1,332	45.2	1,233	41.8	298	10.1	143	8.8	960	59.1	520	32.0
Computer Assisted Instruction	36	1.2	2,053	69.5	525	17.8	340	11.5	9	1.0	235	26.1	656	72.9
Flexible Scheduling	124	4.2	2,492	84.4	240	8.1	97	3.3	17	3.6	232	49.8	217	46.6
Team Teaching	354	12.0	1,081	36.6	595	20.1	926	31.3	141	7.5	798	42.6	935	49.9
College Credit Courses	47	1.6	1,781	60.3	603	20.4	523	17.7	143	12.1	274	23.3	760	64.6
Non-Graded Programs	11	0.4	2,409	81.5	185	6.3	351	11.9	15	2.7	91	16.6	442	80.7
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	102	3.5	1,113	37.7	965	32.7	775	26.2	66	3.6	868	47.1	909	49.3
Differentiated Staffing	7	0.2	2,627	88.8	127	4.3	196	6.6	26	7.9	62	18.8	242	73.3
School-Within-A-School	17	0.6	2,792	94.4	79	2.7	69	2.3	19	11.4	40	24.0	108	64.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	22	0.7	2,356	79.7	217	7.3	362	12.2	49	8.2	130	21.7	420	70.1
Optional Class Attendance	22	0.7	2,735	92.6	39	1.3	158	5.3	4	1.8	38	17.3	178	80.9
Extended School Year	8	0.3	2,882	97.5	43	1.5	22	0.7	6	8.2	15	20.5	52	71.2
Action Learning	20	0.7	1,254	42.5	1,021	34.6	658	22.3	193	11.3	460	27.0	1,049	61.6
Early Leaving Plan	12	0.4	1,225	41.5	1,068	36.1	650	22.0	91	5.3	468	27.1	1,171	67.7
Total	2,117	2.2	67,259	69.0	14,240	14.6	13,876	14.2	1,594	5.3	9,136	30.2	19,521	64.5

62.3 per cent; and team teaching, 63.4 per cent.

Innovations which were reported adopted by relatively few schools were the following: extended school year adopted by 2.5 per cent of the schools; SSSP Physical Science, 4.3 per cent; school-within-a-school, 5.6 per cent; optional class attendance, 7.4 per cent; HSGP Geography, 7.8 per cent; and SRSS Sociology, 8.2 per cent.

The majority of those innovations adopted had been implemented in 1970 or later. Only 35.5 per cent had been adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Parochial or Diocesan Schools

Parochial or diocesan schools reported abandonment of 1.1 innovations per school following adoption of an average of 12.6 per school. Those innovations most frequently abandoned were: PSSC Physics, 15.4 per cent; team teaching, 14.5 per cent; humanities courses, 12 per cent; data processing equipment, 8.5 per cent; flexible scheduling, 7.7 per cent; IPS Physical Science and college credit courses, 6 per cent; and programmed instruction, 5.1 per cent as illustrated in Table XVII.

Fourteen of the innovations were reported abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of responding schools. Of these, the following were reported as never having been abandoned: extended school year, cultural enrichment program, school-within-a-school, telephone amplification, individual prescription of instruction, HSGP Geography, learning packages, and SSSP Physical Science; adoption by a majority of parochial or diocesan schools was reported for the following twelve innovations: PSSC Physics, independent study programs, mini-courses, learning packages, ethnic studies, simulation or gaming, data processing equipment, flexible scheduling, team teaching, college credit courses, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, and early leaving plan. The most widely adopted and durable innovation reported was independent study programs which had been adopted by 77.8 per cent of responding schools and abandoned by 2.6 per cent.

Least popular of the innovations among parochial or diocesan schools were: extended school year, adopted by 0.9 per cent of the schools; SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, and telephone amplification, 4.3 per cent: and optional class attendance, 9.4 per cent.

As with public schools, the majority of innovations were adopted in 1970 or later, with only 31.4 per cent adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovation in Private, Religious Affiliated Schools

Private, religious affiliated schools, as shown in Table XVIII, reported a slightly higher degree of abandonment of innovations than did parochial or diocesan schools, with an average of 1.2 innovations reported abandoned per school, following adoption of an average of 11.9 per school. Several innovations were reported to have been abandoned by relatively few schools with the following showing no abandonment: career education, individual prescription of instruction,

TABLE XVII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974-	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	18	15.4	56	47.9	37	31.6	6	5.1	12	19.7	38	62.3	11	18.0
Harvard Physics	2	1.7	93	79.5	17	14.5	5	4.3	0	0.0	9	37.5	15	62.5
ESCP Physical Science	1	0.9	104	88.9	9	7.7	3	2.6	0	0.0	6	46.2	7	53.8
SSSP Physical Science	0	0.0	112	95.7	3	2.6	2	1.7	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
IPS Physical Science	7	6.0	65	55.6	35	29.9	10	8.5	1	1.9	14	26.4	38	71.7
Humanities	14	12.0	59	50.4	26	22.2	18	15.4	0	0.0	27	46.6	31	53.4
Career Education	1	0.9	72	61.5	11	9.4	33	28.2	2	4.4	3	6.7	40	88.9
Independent Study Programs	3	2.6	26	22.2	26	22.2	62	53.0	0	0.0	17	18.7	74	81.3
Mini-Courses	3	2.6	41	35.0	33	28.2	40	34.2	1	1.3	14	18.4	61	80.3
Learning Packages	0	0.0	43	37.4	20	17.4	52	45.2	1	1.4	9	12.2	64	86.5
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	112	95.7	1	0.9	4	3.4	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
IPI	0	0.0	97	82.9	3	2.6	17	14.5	0	0.0	3	15.0	17	85.0
SRSS Sociology	1	0.9	103	88.0	8	6.8	5	4.3	0	0.0	7	50.0	7	50.0
Ethnic Studies	4	3.4	40	34.2	34	29.1	39	33.3	3	3.9	9	11.7	65	84.4
Television Instruction	4	3.4	93	79.5	5	4.3	15	12.8	4	16.7	2	8.3	18	75.0
Programmed Instruction	6	5.1	61	52.1	9	7.7	41	35.0	1	1.8	14	25.0	41	73.2
Teaching Machines	3	2.6	88	75.2	7	6.0	19	16.2	4	13.8	8	27.6	17	58.6
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	112	95.7	3	2.6	2	1.7	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0
Simulation or Gaming	2	1.7	30	25.6	29	24.8	56	47.9	1	1.1	6	6.9	80	92.0
Data Processing Equipment	10	8.5	47	40.2	45	38.5	15	12.8	8	11.4	40	57.1	22	31.4
Computer Assisted Instruction	2	1.7	90	76.9	13	11.1	12	10.3	0	0.0	8	29.6	19	70.4
Flexible Scheduling	9	7.7	50	42.7	46	39.3	12	10.3	1	1.5	28	41.2	39	57.4
Team Teaching	17	14.5	26	22.2	29	24.8	45	38.5	4	4.4	44	48.4	43	47.3
College Credit Courses	7	6.0	40	34.2	35	29.9	35	29.9	1	1.3	23	30.3	52	68.4
Non-Graded Programs	2	1.7	91	77.8	3	2.6	21	17.9	1	3.8	5	19.2	20	76.9
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	1	0.9	44	37.6	21	17.9	51	43.6	0	0.0	24	32.9	49	67.1
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.9	81	69.2	16	13.7	19	16.2	2	5.6	9	25.0	25	69.4
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	112	95.7	1	0.9	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0	69	59.0	19	16.2	29	24.8	4	8.3	10	20.8	34	70.8
Optional Class Attendance	1	0.9	106	90.6	1	0.9	9	7.7	0	00.0	0	0.0	11	100.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	116	99.1	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
Action Learning	3	2.6	59	50.4	14	12.0	41	35.0	0	0.0	10	17.2	48	82.8
Early Leaving Plan	3	2.6	53	45.3	23	19.7	38	32.5	1	1.6	15	23.4	48	75.0
Total	125	3.2	2,391	62.0	582	15.1	761	19.7	53	3.6	409	27.8	1,009	68.6

teaching machines, telephone amplification, extended school year.

Independent study programs, simulation or gaming, and college credit courses were the most popular innovations, with independent study programs having been adopted by 78.6 per cent of responding schools. Of the three, simulation and gaming was abandoned by the fewest (0.8 per cent) of the schools. The least popular innovations were: SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, telephone amplification, school-within-a-school, and the extended school year, all of which were adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools in this category.

Slightly earlier adoption of the innovations included in this study were reported by private, religious affiliated schools than by parochial or diocesan schools. In all 34.1 per cent of the innovations had been adopted prior to 1970 as compared to 31.4 per cent in parochial schools.

Status of Innovations in Private, Not Religious Affiliated Schools

The data in Table XIX indicate that the twenty-two schools designated as private, not religious affiliated, reported the highest degree of abandonment among schools categorized by source of support. An average of 1.4 innovations per school were reported abandoned. Those most frequently abandoned were: PSSC Physics and ESCP Physical Science abandoned by 22.7 of the schools; flexible scheduling and team teaching, 18.2 per cent and programmed instruction and data

TABLE XVIII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING PRIVATE, RELIGIOUS AFFILIATED SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		Year Adopted 1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	26	19.8	51	38.9	38	29.0	16	12.2	13	16.2	45	56.3	22	27.5
Harvard Physics	8	6.2	99	76.2	20	15.4	3	2.3	0	0.0	12	38.7	19	61.3
ESCP Physical Science	3	2.3	112	85.5	11	8.4	5	3.8	0	0.0	12	63.2	7	36.8
SSSP Physical Science	2	1.5	124	94.7	3	2.3	2	1.5	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0
IPS Physical Science	11	8.4	70	53.4	40	30.5	10	7.6	1	1.7	25	41.7	34	56.7
Humanities	12	9.2	59	45.4	40	30.8	19	14.6	2	2.8	31	43.1	39	54.2
Career Education	0	0.0	101	77.1	8	6.1	22	16.8	2	6.7	2	6.7	26	86.7
Independent Study Programs	5	3.8	28	21.4	33	25.2	65	49.6	0	0.0	29	28.2	74	71.8
Mini-Courses	4	3.1	52	39.7	31	23.7	44	33.6	1	1.3	16	20.3	62	78.5
Learning Packages	7	5.3	61	46.6	17	13.0	46	35.1	0	0.0	10	14.3	60	85.7
HSGP Geography	1	0.8	123	93.9	5	3.8	2	1.5	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	85.7
IPI	0	0.0	112	86.2	2	1.5	16	12.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	100.0
SRSS Sociology	2	1.5	114	87.0	5	3.8	10	7.6	0	0.0	6	35.3	11	64.7
Ethnic Studies	9	6.9	61	46.6	28	21.4	33	25.2	3	4.3	10	14.3	57	81.4
Television Instruction	9	6.9	103	79.2	3	2.3	15	11.5	2	7.4	13	48.1	12	44.4
Programmed Instruction	6	4.6	73	55.7	6	4.6	46	35.1	2	3.4	13	22.4	43	74.1
Teaching Machines	0	0.0	107	81.7	6	4.6	18	13.7	1	4.2	6	25.0	17	70.8
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	126	96.2	1	0.8	4	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
Simulation or Gaming	1	0.8	32	24.4	27	20.6	71	54.2	1	1.0	12	12.1	86	86.9
Data Processing Equipment	11	8.4	66	50.4	42	32.1	12	9.2	3	4.6	46	70.8	16	24.6
Computer Assisted Instruction	7	5.3	97	74.0	19	14.5	8	6.1	1	2.9	16	47.1	17	50.0
Flexible Scheduling	7	5.4	72	55.4	43	33.1	8	6.2	1	1.7	28	48.3	29	50.0
Team Teaching	9	6.9	33	25.2	33	25.2	56	42.7	4	4.1	44	44.9	50	51.0
College Credit Courses	4	3.1	29	22.1	51	38.9	47	35.9	11	10.8	23	22.5	68	66.7
Non-Graded Programs	1	0.8	110	84.0	6	4.6	14	10.7	1	4.8	4	19.0	16	76.2
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	1	0.8	61	46.6	18	13.7	51	38.9	2	2.9	18	25.7	50	71.4
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.8	110	84.0	4	3.1	16	12.2	3	14.3	4	19.0	14	66.7
School-Within-A-School	2	1.5	128	97.7	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
Cultural Enrichment Program	2	1.5	75	57.3	20	15.3	34	26.0	5	8.9	8	14.3	43	76.8
Optional Class Attendance	4	3.1	114	87.0	3	2.3	10	7.6	0	0.0	4	23.5	13	76.5
Extended School Year	0	0.0	129	98.5	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
Action Learning	1	0.8	66	50.4	23	17.6	41	31.3	1	1.5	7	10.8	57	87.7
Early Leaving Plan	3	2.3	63	48.1	27	20.6	38	29.0	3	4.4	17	25.0	48	70.6
Total	159	3.7	2,761	63.9	615	14.2	783	18.1	64	4.1	466	30.0	1,025	65.9

processing equipment, 9.1 per cent. The schools in this category reported either rather high degrees of abandonment or no abandonment at all, with nineteen innovations reported as never abandoned.

Of the innovations adopted, team teaching proved to be the most popular having been adopted by 95.5 per cent of the schools. Others adopted by a majority of the schools were: independent study programs, simulation or gaming, college credit courses, and early leaving plan. Least popular were: HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, telephone amplification, school-within-a-school, and extended school year, all of which had been adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools. However, each of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by one or more of the schools in this classification.

Private, not religious affiliated schools reported earlier adoption of the innovations in this study than did schools in the four other categories, with 37.5 per cent of the innovations reported adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Government Schools

The highest degree of adoption of the selected innovations took place in government schools, with an average of 12.9 innovations adopted per school. Innovations abandoned after trial averaged 1.05 per school. As illustrated in Table XX, those innovations most frequently abandoned were: IPS Physical Science reported abandoned by 20.5 per cent; humanities courses, 13.6 per cent; team teaching, 11.6 per

TABLE XIX

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING PRIVATE, NOT RELIGIOUS AFFILIATED SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted Before 1965		1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	5	22.7	11	50.0	4	18.2	2	9.1	2	18.2	5	45.5	4	36.4
Harvard Physics	1	4.5	13	59.1	5	22.7	3	13.6	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7
ESCP Physical Science	5	22.7	12	54.5	3	13.6	2	9.1	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	1	4.5	19	86.4	1	4.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
IPS Physical Science	1	4.5	14	63.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5
Humanities	0	0.0	13	59.1	5	22.7	4	18.2	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4
Career Education	0	0.0	14	63.6	4	18.2	4	18.2	3	37.5	1	12.5	4	50.0
Independent Study Programs	0	0.0	7	31.8	8	36.4	7	31.8	0	0.0	2	13.5	13	86.7
Mini-Courses	0	0.0	11	50.0	5	22.7	6	27.3	0	0.0	3	27.3	8	72.7
Learning Packages	1	4.5	14	63.6	3	13.6	4	18.2	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
IPI	0	0.0	16	72.7	1	4.5	5	22.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	0	0.0	11	50.0	4	18.2	7	31.8	0	0.0	1	9.1	10	90.9
Television Instruction	0	0.0	17	77.3	4	18.2	1	4.5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
Programmed Instruction	2	9.1	13	59.1	3	13.6	4	18.2	2	22.2	1	11.1	6	66.7
Teaching Machines	0	0.0	16	72.7	2	9.1	4	18.2	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	83.3
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Simulation or Gaming	1	4.5	5	22.7	5	22.7	11	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0
Data Processing Equipment	2	9.1	16	72.7	3	13.6	1	4.5	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0	14	63.6	4	18.2	4	18.2	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	87.5
Flexible Scheduling	4	18.2	16	72.7	2	9.1	0	0.0	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
Team Teaching	4	18.2	1	4.5	8	36.4	9	40.9	3	14.3	7	33.3	11	52.4
College Credit Courses	1	4.5	5	22.7	11	50.0	5	22.7	3	17.6	5	29.4	9	52.9
Non-Graded Programs	1	4.5	17	77.3	2	9.1	2	9.1	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	0	0.0	17	77.3	3	13.6	2	9.1	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	14	63.6	4	18.2	4	18.2	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	20	95.2	1	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0	11	52.4	5	23.8	5	23.8	2	18.2	5	45.5	4	26.4
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0	17	77.3	1	4.5	4	18.2	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	20	90.9	2	9.1	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	11	50.0	8	36.4	3	13.6	0	0.0	7	63.6	4	36.4
Early Leaving Plan	1	4.5	8	36.4	7	31.8	6	27.3	2	14.3	4	28.6	8	57.1
Total	30	4.1	456	63.0	126	17.4	112	15.5	27	10.0	74	27.5	168	62.5

cent; mini-courses, 11.4 per cent; PSSC Physics and ethnic studies, 6.8 per cent. In several instances, no abandonment was reported by schools in this group. Those innovations reported in use with no abandonment were: Harvard Physics, career education, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, television instruction, simulation or gaming, non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment programs, optional class attendance, extended school year, action learning, and early leaving plan.

Twelve of the innovations were reported adopted by a majority of government schools. Of these, IPS Physical Science, independent study programs, ethnic studies, action learning, and early leaving plans had been adopted by 75 per cent or more of the schools. Those reported adopted by relatively few schools were: SSSP Physical Science abandoned by the one school which adopted it; SRSS Sociology, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, and extended school year. Telephone amplification was the only innovation which had not been adopted by any responding school.

Although reporting the highest degree of adoption, government schools also tended toward later adoption than schools in any of the other categories in this classification with 70.1 per cent of the innovations adopted in 1970 or later.

TABLE XX

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	3	6.8	15	34.1	20	45.5	6	13.6	2	6.9	18	62.1	9	31.0
Harvard Physics	0	0.0	35	79.5	2	4.5	[illegible]	15.9	0	0.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
ESCP Physical Science	1	2.3	39	88.6	3	6.8	1	2.3	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
SSSP Physical Science	1	2.3	43	97.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
IPS Physical Science	9	20.5	9	20.5	24	54.5	2	4.5	1	2.9	21	60.0	13	37.1
Humanities	6	13.6	18	40.9	12	27.3	8	18.2	2	7.7	12	46.2	12	46.2
Career Education	0	0.0	13	29.5	13	29.5	18	40.9	1	3.3	2	6.7	27	90.0
Independent Study Programs	2	4.5	7	15.9	10	22.7	25	56.8	1	2.7	4	10.8	32	86.5
Mini-Courses	5	11.4	13	29.5	16	36.4	10	22.7	0	0.0	4	12.9	27	87.1
Learning Packages	1	2.3	22	50.0	8	18.2	13	29.5	1	4.5	1	4.5	20	90.9
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	38	86.4	3	6.8	3	6.8	1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4
IPI	0	0.0	36	81.8	3	6.8	5	11.4	1	12.5	0	0.0	7	87.5
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	41	93.2	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	3	6.8	11	25.0	20	45.5	10	22.7	2	6.1	5	15.2	26	78.8
Television Instruction	0	0.0	38	86.4	1	2.3	5	11.4	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
Programmed Instruction	1	2.3	24	54.5	3	6.8	16	36.4	2	10.0	2	10.0	16	80.0
Teaching Machines	1	2.3	34	77.3	2	4.5	7	15.9	2	20.0	1	10.0	7	70.0
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	44	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0	16	36.4	13	29.5	15	34.1	2	7.1	3	10.7	23	82.1
Data Processing Equipment	2	4.5	31	70.5	7	15.9	4	9.1	0	0.0	7	53.8	6	46.2
Computer Assisted Instruction	1	2.3	36	81.8	3	6.8	4	9.1	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
Flexible Scheduling	2	4.5	36	81.8	3	6.8	3	6.8	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	37.5
Team Teaching	5	11.6	16	37.2	4	9.3	18	41.9	0	0.0	10	37.0	17	63.0
College Credit Courses	1	2.3	25	56.8	6	13.6	12	27.3	2	10.5	1	5.3	16	84.2
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0	22	50.0	10	22.7	12	27.3	1	4.3	3	13.0	19	82.6
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2	4.5	15	34.1	14	31.8	13	29.5	1	3.4	10	34.5	18	62.1
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	40	90.9	2	4.5	2	4.5	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	41	93.2	1	2.3	2	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0	25	56.8	9	20.5	10	22.7	3	15.8	3	15.8	13	68.4
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0	36	81.8	3	6.8	5	11.4	0	0.0	2	25.0	6	75.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	43	97.7	1	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	13	29.5	21	47.7	10	22.7	0	0.0	5	16.1	26	83.9
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	9	20.5	23	52.3	12	27.3	0	0.0	10	28.6	25	71.4
Total	46	3.2	884	60.9	263	18.1	258	17.8	26	4.6	144	25.4	398	70.1

Status of Innovations by Type of Community in Which School is Located

The data in Tables XXI - XXVIII illustrate the status of the thirty-three innovations by type of community in which the responding school was located. The results of the study differ from the findings in Cawelti's study in that the degree of adoption of innovations in suburban schools was slightly lower than that reported by urban schools in cities of 100,000 residents or more. Cawelti found that adoption in suburban schools exceeded that of urban schools. The responding suburban schools in this study reported an average adoption of 12.7 innovations per school as compared to an average of 12.9 for urban schools. Abandonment reported by responding schools in both urban and suburban communities was identical -- an average of 0.93 per school.

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of Over 400,000 Residents

The status of the thirty-three innovations in schools located in cities of over 400,000 residents is illustrated in Table XXI. The schools in this category reported one of the highest degrees of adoption - 13.2 innovations per school - of any category of schools classified by location. The abandonment of 1.08 per school was almost identical to that reported by schools in cities of 200,000-299,999 residents.

The innovations reported abandoned most frequently by the responding schools were: PSSC Physics, 16.1 per cent;

team teaching, 13.1 per cent; humanities courses and television instruction, 10.5 per cent; IPS Physical Science, 7.1 per cent; flexible scheduling, 4.9 per cent; and Harvard Physics, 4.2 per cent. Those innovations which were reported abandoned by relatively few schools were: action learning, differentiated staffing, non-graded programs, and individual prescription of instruction which were abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of the schools.

Of the thirty-three innovations in the study, an average of twelve had been adopted by a majority of schools in this category. The most durable innovation reported was the use of teacher aides and para-professionals which had been adopted by 75.7 per cent of the schools while being abandoned by 1.5 per cent. Those innovations adopted by relatively few schools were: SSSP Physical Science, school-within-a-school, optional class attendance, and extended school year - all adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools.

The majority of the innovations (60.1 per cent) were adopted in 1970 or later. This represents the earliest adoption of the thirty-three innovations reported by all categories of schools by location. Some of the most notable early adoptions were: PSSC Physics, humanities courses, data processing equipment, teacher aides and para-professionals and extended school year, the majority of whose adoptions took place prior to 1970.

TABLE XXI

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN CITIES OF OVER 400,000 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted: Before 1965		Year Adopted: 1965-69		Year Adopted: 1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	43	16.1	125	46.8	71	26.6	28	10.5	27	19.0	89	62.7	26	18.3
Harvard Physics	11	4.2	206	77.7	37	14.0	11	4.2	2	3.3	17	28.3	41	68.3
ESCP Physical Science	8	3.0	205	76.8	39	14.6	15	5.6	0	0.0	26	41.9	36	58.1
SSSP Physical Science	4	1.5	253	94.8	7	2.6	3	1.1	3	21.4	4	28.6	7	50.0
IPS Physical Science	19	7.1	152	56.9	67	25.1	29	10.9	5	4.4	32	28.1	77	67.5
Humanities	28	10.5	115	43.2	84	31.6	39	14.7	9	5.9	71	46.7	72	47.4
Career Education	3	1.1	140	52.6	59	22.2	64	24.1	18	14.3	15	11.9	93	73.8
Independent Study Programs	7	2.6	102	38.3	46	17.3	111	41.7	7	4.3	36	22.0	121	73.8
Mini-Courses	7	2.6	108	40.4	76	28.5	76	28.5	2	1.3	31	19.5	126	79.2
Learning Packages	5	1.9	135	50.9	27	10.2	98	37.0	3	2.3	22	16.9	105	80.8
HSGP Geography	3	1.1	234	88.0	14	5.3	15	5.6	2	6.3	8	25.0	22	68.8
IPI	0	0.0	212	80.0	10	3.8	43	16.2	1	1.9	4	7.4	49	90.7
SRSS Sociology	3	1.1	225	84.3	18	6.7	21	7.9	2	4.8	16	38.1	24	57.1
Ethnic Studies	7	2.6	77	28.8	131	49.1	52	19.5	7	3.7	43	22.8	139	73.5
Television Instruction	28	10.5	182	68.2	20	7.5	37	13.9	11	12.9	31	36.5	43	50.6
Programmed Instruction	8	3.0	157	58.8	21	7.9	81	30.3	8	7.2	25	22.5	78	70.3
Teaching Machines	6	2.2	179	67.0	23	8.6	59	22.1	9	10.2	21	23.9	58	65.9
Telephone Amplification	3	1.1	238	89.1	11	4.1	15	5.6	3	9.7	10	32.3	18	58.1
Simulation or Gaming	3	1.1	81	30.3	51	19.1	132	49.4	6	3.2	25	13.5	154	83.2
Data Processing Equipment	8	3.0	72	27.1	146	54.9	40	15.0	33	16.9	106	54.4	56	28.7
Computer Assisted Instruction	4	1.5	137	51.5	83	31.2	42	15.8	2	1.5	42	32.3	86	66.2
Flexible Scheduling	13	4.9	206	77.2	33	12.4	15	5.6	3	4.9	26	42.6	32	52.5
Team Teaching	35	13.1	60	22.5	68	25.5	104	39.0	15	7.2	91	44.0	101	48.8
College Credit Courses	9	3.4	91	34.1	112	41.9	55	20.6	46	26.3	41	23.4	88	40.3
Non-Graded Programs	1	0.4	211	79.0	18	6.7	37	13.9	4	7.1	10	17.9	42	75.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	4	1.5	65	24.3	119	44.6	79	29.6	12	5.9	96	47.5	94	46.5
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.4	224	83.9	15	5.6	27	10.1	5	11.6	8	18.6	30	69.8
School-Within-A-School	3	1.1	245	92.1	9	3.4	9	3.4	3	14.3	5	23.8	13	61.9
Cultural Enrichment Program	4	1.5	153	57.3	54	20.2	56	21.0	18	15.8	27	23.7	69	60.5
Optional Class Attendance	3	1.1	241	90.3	6	2.2	17	6.4	1	3.8	3	11.5	22	84.6
Extended School Year	3	1.1	254	95.1	8	3.0	2	0.7	3	23.1	6	46.2	4	30.8
Action Learning	2	0.7	86	32.2	107	40.1	72	27.0	29	16.0	56	30.9	96	53.0
Early Leaving Plan	3	1.1	107	40.1	91	34.1	66	24.7	25	15.6	40	25.0	95	59.4
Total	289	3.3	5,278	60.0	1,681	19.1	1,550	17.6	324	9.2	1,083	30.7	2,117	60.1

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 300,000-399,999

Table XXII illustrates the status of the thirty-three selected innovations in schools located in non-suburban communities of 300,000-399,999 persons. A total of forty-nine or 1.5 per cent of the responding schools were in this category.

Those innovations abandoned most frequently were: PSSC Physics abandoned by 10.2 per cent of responding schools; flexible scheduling, 8.2 per cent; college credit courses, team teaching, data processing equipment, independent study programs, and humanities courses, 6.1 per cent; ethnic studies, 4.1 per cent; mini-courses and IPS Physical Science, 4.1 per cent. All other innovations were abandoned by relatively few schools and the following showed no abandonment: action learning, early leaving plan, computer assisted instruction and career education -- all adopted by a majority of the schools. SSSP Physical Science, learning packages, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, programmed instruction, telephone amplification, differentiated staffing, and extended school year had been adopted by less than a majority of the schools in this category but also had suffered no abandonment. On the average, 0.84 innovations had been abandoned per school.

An average of 12.4 innovations in the study had been adopted by these schools in the study with 6.5 currently fully implemented and operating. The innovations least

TABLE XXII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN NON-SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES OF 300,000-399,999 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	5	10.2	26	53.1	11	22.4	7	14.3	7	30.4	12	52.2	4	17.4
Harvard Physics	1	2.0	40	81.6	2	4.1	6	12.2	0	0.0	4	44.4	5	55.6
ESCP Physical Science	1	2.0	39	79.6	5	10.2	4	8.2	1	10.0	4	40.0	5	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	0	0.0	44	89.8	4	8.2	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
IPS Physical Science	2	4.1	33	67.3	9	18.4	5	10.2	0	0.0	5	29.4	12	70.6
Humanities	3	6.1	25	51.0	19	38.8	2	4.1	1	4.2	13	54.2	10	41.7
Career Education	0	0.0	21	42.9	12	24.5	16	32.7	0	0.0	1	3.6	27	96.4
Independent Study Programs	3	6.1	18	36.7	11	22.4	17	34.7	0	0.0	6	19.4	25	80.6
Mini-Courses	2	4.1	22	44.9	14	28.6	11	22.4	0	0.0	3	11.1	24	88.9
Learning Packages	0	0.0	27	55.1	5	10.2	17	34.7	0	0.0	4	18.2	18	81.8
HSGP Geography	1	2.0	44	89.8	4	8.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
IPI	0	0.0	42	85.7	1	2.0	6	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	47	95.9	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Ethnic Studies	2	4.1	15	30.6	23	46.9	9	18.4	0	0.0	5	14.7	29	85.3
Television Instruction	1	2.0	32	65.3	7	14.3	9	18.4	1	5.9	1	5.9	15	88.2
Programmed Instruction	0	0.0	30	61.2	4	8.2	15	30.6	1	5.3	2	10.5	16	84.2
Teaching Machines	1	2.0	37	75.5	5	10.2	6	12.2	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.7
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	45	91.8	1	2.0	3	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Simulation or Gaming	1	2.0	21	42.9	9	18.4	18	36.7	1	3.6	1	3.6	26	92.9
Data Processing Equipment	3	6.1	13	26.5	32	65.3	1	2.0	1	2.8	29	80.6	6	16.7
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0	18	36.7	25	51.0	6	12.2	0	0.0	14	45.2	17	54.8
Flexible Scheduling	4	8.2	43	87.8	2	4.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
Team Teaching	3	6.1	10	20.4	20	40.8	16	32.7	4	10.3	16	41.0	19	48.7
College Credit Courses	3	6.1	22	44.9	13	26.5	11	22.4	5	17.9	6	21.4	17	60.7
Non-Graded Programs	1	2.0	37	75.5	5	10.2	6	12.2	0	0.0	2	16.7	10	83.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	1	2.0	12	24.5	22	44.9	14	28.6	2	5.4	21	56.8	14	37.8
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	41	83.7	5	10.2	3	6.1	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	87.5
School-Within-A-School	1	2.0	44	89.8	2	4.1	2	4.1	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	1	2.0	34	69.4	4	8.2	10	20.4	1	6.7	4	26.7	10	66.7
Optional Class Attendance	1	2.0	46	93.9	0	0.0	2	4.1	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
Extended School Year	0	0.0	48	98.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Action Leaving	0	0.0	18	36.7	23	46.9	8	16.3	3	9.7	7	22.6	21	67.7
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	17	34.7	20	40.8	12	24.5	1	3.1	7	21.9	24	75.0
Total	41	2.5	1,011	62.5	320	19.8	245	15.2	30	4.9	183	30.1	395	65.0

popular were: the extended school year, optional class attendance, telephone amplification and SRSS Sociology -- all adopted by less than 10 per cent of the schools in this category. In the main, adoption came somewhat later in these schools as compared with schools in cities of 400,000 persons or more, with 65 per cent of the innovations adopted in 1970 or later.

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 200,000-299,999

Schools located in non-suburban communities of 200,000-299,999 residents, as shown in Table XXIII, like those in the previous category reported adoption of a relatively large number of the thirty-three innovations with no abandonment. In all, fourteen adopted innovations had not been abandoned. These were: early leaving plan, action learning, extended school year, school-within-a-school, differentiated staffing, non-graded programs, computer assisted instruction, simulation or gaming, telephone amplification, SRSS Sociology, individual prescription of instruction, HSGP Geography, SSSP Physical Science, and ESCP Physical Science.

Those innovations abandoned by a relatively large number of the schools in this category were: team teaching which was abandoned by 19.5 per cent of the schools; humanities courses, 12.2 per cent; PSSC Physics, learning packages, ethnic studies, and television instruction, 7.3 per cent; IPS Physical Science, independent study programs, mini-courses, programmed instruction, flexible scheduling, college credit courses, and teacher aides or para-professionals, 4.9 per cent. On the average 1.10 of the innovations had been abandoned after trial by the responding schools.

Among the innovations most popular with the schools in this category were the following which had been adopted by a majority of schools: humanities courses, independent study courses, mini-courses, learning packages, ethnic studies, simulation or gaming, data processing equipment, computer assisted instruction, team teaching, college credit courses, teacher aides or para-professionals, action learning, and early leaving plan. Among the least popular were the following which had been adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools: extended school year, school-within-a-school, flexible scheduling, SRSS Sociology, individual prescription of instruction, HSGP Geography, and SSSP Physical Science. An average of 13.3 of the innovations, slightly higher than the previous category, had been adopted by the schools in this group. Again, the majority had been adopted in 1970 or later with only 2.7 per cent adopted prior to 1965. It is interesting to note that in all schools in all categories in this study with the exception of schools of fewer than 200 pupils, the adoption of PSSC Physics declined sharply after 1969. This is emphasized because of the impressive record of adoption compiled in the first few years after its introduction.

TABLE XXIII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN NON-SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES OF 200,000-299,999 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	3	7.3	21	51.2	15	36.6	2	4.9	3	15.0	13	65.0	4	64.8
Harvard Physics	1	2.4	34	82.9	6	14.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	85.7	1	14.3
ESCP Physical Science	0	0.0	33	80.5	4	9.8	4	9.8	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
SSSP Physical Science	0	0.0	39	95.1	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0
IPS Physical Science	2	4.9	31	75.6	7	17.1	1	2.4	0	0.0	5	50.0	5	50.0
Humanities	5	12.2	13	31.7	18	43.9	5	12.2	1	3.7	16	59.3	10	37.0
Career Education	1	2.4	21	51.2	7	17.1	12	29.3	0	0.0	2	10.0	18	90.0
Independent Study Programs	2	4.9	9	22.0	8	19.5	22	53.7	0	0.0	8	25.0	24	75.0
Mini-Courses	2	4.9	16	39.0	13	31.7	10	24.4	0	0.0	6	24.0	19	76.0
Learning Packages	3	7.3	18	43.9	5	12.2	15	36.6	0	0.0	4	17.4	19	82.6
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	40	97.6	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
IPI	0	0.0	37	90.2	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	37	90.2	1	2.4	3	7.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Ethnic Studies	3	7.3	17	41.5	17	41.5	4	9.8	0	0.0	7	29.2	17	70.8
Television Instruction	3	7.3	32	78.0	1	2.4	5	12.2	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
Programmed Instruction	2	4.9	23	56.1	2	4.9	14	34.1	2	11.1	1	5.6	15	83.3
Teaching Machines	1	2.4	30	73.2	3	7.3	7	17.1	0	0.0	4	36.4	7	63.6
Telephone Amplification	0	0.0	36	87.8	2	4.9	3	7.3	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0	7	17.1	11	26.8	23	56.1	0	0.0	5	14.7	29	85.3
Data Processing Equipment	1	2.4	6	14.6	31	75.6	3	7.3	3	8.6	26	74.3	6	17.1
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0	15	36.6	17	41.5	9	22.0	0	0.0	6	23.1	20	76.9
Flexible Scheduling	2	4.9	37	90.2	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
Team Teaching	8	19.5	8	19.5	10	24.4	15	36.6	2	6.1	11	33.3	20	60.6
College Credit Courses	2	4.9	15	36.6	11	26.8	13	31.7	1	3.8	6	23.1	19	73.1
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0	29	70.7	3	7.3	9	22.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	19	83.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2	4.9	8	19.5	21	51.2	10	24.4	0	0.0	20	60.6	13	39.4
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	36	87.8	4	9.8	1	2.4	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	39	95.1	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	1	2.4	24	58.5	6	14.6	10	24.4	0	0.0	2	11.8	15	88.2
Optional Class Attendance	1	2.4	32	78.0	2	4.9	6	14.6	0	0.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
Extended School Year	0	0.0	37	90.2	3	7.3	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	13	31.7	14	34.1	14	34.1	1	3.6	5	17.9	22	78.6
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0	13	31.7	18	43.9	10	24.4	2	7.1	5	17.9	21	75.0
Total	45	3.3	806	59.6	267	19.7	235	17.4	15	2.7	177	32.4	354	64.8

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 100,000-199,999

The 125 schools included in Table XXIV were located in non-suburban communities of 100,000-199,999 and reported the second lowest degree of abandonment with an average of 0.71 innovations abandoned per school. Those innovations reported most often abandoned were: PSSC Physics, 15.3 per cent; team teaching, 10.4 per cent; IPS Physical Science, 6.5 per cent; and humanities courses, 5.6 per cent.

Eighteen innovations were reported abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of the schools in this category with the following abandoned by none of the schools: action learning, extended school year, cultural enrichment program, differentiated staffing, non-graded programs, data processing equipment, simulation or gaming, SRSS Sociology, individual prescription of instruction, HSGP Geography, learning packages, and independent study programs.

Although abandoned by 10.4 per cent of the schools reporting, team teaching was adopted by 78.4 per cent -- the largest adoption of any innovation. Other popular innovations were the following which were adopted by a majority of schools in this category: PSSC Physics, career education, independent study programs, mini-courses, ethnic studies, simulation and gaming, data processing equipment, team teaching, college credit courses, teacher aides or para-professionals, action learning, and early leaving plan.

The schools in this category had adopted an average of

TABLE XXIV

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN NON-SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES OF 100,000-199,999 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	19	15.3	60	48.4	41	33.1	4	3.2	17	26.6	34	53.1	13	20.3
Harvard Physics	2	1.6	92	74.2	21	16.9	9	7.3	0	0.0	15	48.4	16	51.6
ESCP Physical Science	1	0.8	101	80.8	14	11.2	9	7.2	1	4.2	11	45.8	12	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	1	0.8	115	92.0	8	6.4	1	0.8	0	0.0	4	40.0	6	60.0
IPS Physical Science	8	6.5	76	61.3	25	20.2	15	12.1	4	8.5	11	23.4	32	68.1
Humanities	7	5.6	68	54.8	36	29.0	13	10.5	4	7.3	26	47.3	25	45.5
Career Education	1	0.8	55	44.4	24	19.4	44	35.5	2	2.9	6	8.8	60	88.2
Independent Study Programs	0	0.0	33	26.6	38	30.6	53	42.7	3	3.4	22	24.7	64	71.9
Mini-Courses	4	3.2	54	43.5	34	27.4	32	25.8	0	0.0	17	24.3	53	75.7
Learning Packages	0	0.0	63	50.8	14	11.3	47	37.9	0	0.0	12	20.0	48	80.0
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	112	91.1	7	5.7	4	3.3	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
IPI	0	0.0	97	78.9	9	7.3	17	13.8	1	4.0	3	12.0	21	84.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	109	87.2	10	8.0	6	4.8	3	18.8	2	12.5	11	68.8
Ethnic Studies	5	4.0	37	29.6	60	48.0	23	18.4	1	1.1	20	23.0	66	75.9
Television Instruction	1	0.8	94	75.2	9	7.2	21	16.8	3	9.7	2	6.5	26	83.9
Programmed Instruction	2	1.6	67	53.6	12	9.6	44	35.2	3	5.2	14	24.1	41	70.7
Teaching Machines	3	2.4	89	71.2	9	7.2	24	19.2	3	8.3	8	22.2	25	69.4
Telephone Amplification	1	0.8	115	92.0	3	2.4	6	4.8	1	10.0	3	30.0	6	60.0
Simulation or Gaming	[illegible]	0.0	45	36.0	23	18.4	57	45.6	1	1.2	12	15.0	67	83.7
Data Processing Equipment	0	0.0	30	24.4	75	61.0	18	14.6	7	7.4	62	66.0	25	26.6
Computer Assisted Instruction	4	3.2	78	62.4	27	21.6	16	12.8	1	2.1	14	29.8	32	68.1
Flexible Scheduling	4	3.2	100	80.0	15	12.0	6	4.8	1	3.8	11	42.3	14	53.8
Team Teaching	13	10.4	27	21.6	35	28.0	50	40.0	9	9.2	49	50.0	40	40.8
College Credit Courses	4	3.2	59	47.2	40	32.0	22	17.6	11	16.7	16	24.2	39	59.1
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0	93	74.4	10	8.0	22	17.6	0	0.0	2	6.3	30	93.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	4	3.2	31	24.8	55	44.0	35	28.0	3	3.2	50	53.2	41	43.6
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	104	83.2	8	6.4	13	10.4	1	4.8	8	38.1	12	57.1
School-Within-A-School	2	1.6	108	86.4	9	7.2	6	4.8	3	17.6	4	23.5	10	58.8
Cultural Enrichment Program	[illegible]	0.0	93	74.4	9	7.2	23	18.4	2	6.3	6	18.8	24	75.0
Optional Class Attendance	2	1.6	108	86.4	2	1.6	13	10.4	0	0.0	3	17.6	14	82.4
Extended School Year	0	0.0	120	96.0	4	3.2	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
Action Learning	0	0.0	49	39.2	43	34.4	33	26.4	16	21.1	23	30.3	37	48.7
Early Leaving Plan	1	0.8	41	32.8	55	44.0	28	22.4	10	11.9	21	25.0	53	63.1
Total	89	2.2	2,523	61.4	784	19.1	715	17.4	112	7.1	497	31.4	972	61.5

12.7 of the thirty-three innovations per school. Overall SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, telephone amplification and the extended school year were the only innovations adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools.

As with all other categories in this classification, the majority of innovations were adopted in 1970 or later with only 38.5 adopted prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Communities of 5,000-99,999

The largest group of schools by location were those in non-suburban communities of 5,000-99,999. A total of 940 responding schools were in this category.

As the data in Table XXV indicate, those innovations which were reported abandoned more often by the schools in this group were: team teaching, abandoned by 13.8 per cent of the schools; PSSC Physics, 8 per cent; humanities courses, 5.9 per cent; and programmed instruction, 5.3 per cent. On the average 0.76 innovations per school were abandoned by schools in this category. On the other hand, a number of innovations had been abandoned by relatively few schools with the following abandoned by less than 1 per cent of responding schools: Harvard Physics, SSSP Physical Science, career education, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, simulation and gaming, non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment program, optional class attendance, extended school year, action learning, and early leaving plan.

TABLE XXV

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN NON-SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES OF 5,000-99,999 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	75	8.0	581	61.9	219	23.3	63	6.7	47	13.2	226	63.3	84	23.5
Harvard Physics	6	0.6	760	81.2	112	12.0	58	6.2	1	0.6	68	38.6	107	60.8
ESCP Physical Science	19	2.0	775	82.6	88	9.4	56	6.0	8	4.9	86	52.8	69	42.3
SSSP Physical Science	3	0.3	891	95.1	20	2.1	23	2.5	1	2.1	21	44.7	25	53.2
IPS Physical Science	23	2.5	658	79.2	199	21.2	57	6.1	7	2.5	83	29.5	191	68.0
Humanities	55	5.9	575	61.4	221	23.6	85	9.1	22	6.1	187	51.7	153	42.3
Career Education	4	0.4	428	45.8	171	18.3	331	35.4	13	2.6	35	6.9	459	90.5
Independent Study Programs	37	3.9	344	36.7	208	22.2	348	37.1	14	2.4	140	23.6	439	74.0
Mini-Courses	33	3.5	443	47.3	242	25.9	218	23.3	1	0.2	98	19.8	395	80.0
Learning Packages	16	1.7	512	54.6	108	11.5	301	32.1	4	0.9	74	17.5	345	81.6
HSGP Geography	6	0.6	870	92.8	40	4.3	22	2.3	3	4.3	28	40.6	38	55.1
IPI	2	0.2	807	86.1	32	3.4	96	10.2	4	3.1	12	9.3	113	87.6
SRSS Sociology	2	0.2	860	91.9	43	4.6	31	3.3	0	0.0	30	39.5	46	60.5
Ethnic Studies	18	1.9	524	55.9	231	24.6	165	17.6	2	0.5	56	13.5	356	86.0
Television Instruction	37	3.9	698	74.5	82	8.8	120	12.8	22	9.2	56	23.5	160	67.2
Programmed Instruction	50	5.3	600	64.0	71	7.6	217	23.1	20	5.9	92	27.2	226	66.9
Teaching Machines	16	1.7	756	80.6	52	5.5	114	12.2	16	8.8	56	30.8	110	60.4
Telephone Amplification	9	1.0	843	89.9	17	1.8	69	7.4	4	4.2	25	26.3	66	69.5
Simulation or Gaming	6	0.6	311	33.2	220	23.5	399	42.6	10	1.6	83	13.3	532	85.1
Data Processing Equipment	37	4.0	383	40.9	402	42.9	114	12.2	42	7.6	321	57.9	191	34.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	20	2.1	678	72.3	129	13.8	111	11.8	0	0.0	54	20.9	204	79.1
Flexible Scheduling	35	3.7	772	82.4	96	10.2	34	3.6	5	3.0	85	50.6	78	46.4
Team Teaching	129	13.8	288	30.7	207	22.1	314	33.5	47	7.3	283	43.7	318	49.1
College Credit Courses	16	1.7	538	57.4	214	22.8	169	18.0	39	9.7	101	25.2	261	65.1
Non-Graded Programs	2	0.2	767	81.8	68	7.2	101	10.8	6	3.5	32	18.7	133	77.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	31	3.3	357	38.1	287	30.6	263	28.0	15	2.6	282	48.5	284	48.9
Differentiated Staffing	4	0.4	823	87.7	40	4.3	71	7.6	11	9.6	21	18.3	83	72.2
School-Within-A-School	4	0.4	895	95.4	19	2.0	20	2.1	3	7.0	9	20.9	31	72.1
Cultural Enrichment Program	7	0.7	741	79.1	66	7.0	123	13.1	15	7.6	37	18.8	145	73.6
Optional Class Attendance	7	0.7	861	92.1	14	1.5	53	5.7	2	2.7	20	26.7	53	70.7
Extended School Year	1	0.1	928	98.9	5	0.5	4	0.4	1	10.0	1	10.0	8	80.0
Action Learning	4	0.4	388	41.5	349	37.3	194	20.7	72	13.1	146	26.6	331	60.3
Early Leaving Plan	3	0.3	351	37.5	365	39.0	217	23.2	32	5.5	161	27.5	393	67.1
Total	717	2.3	21,006	67.9	4,637	15.0	4,561	14.8	489	4.9	3,009	30.3	6,427	64.8

Only nine of the thirty-three innovations in the study had been adopted by a majority of the schools in this category. These were: career education, independent study programs, mini-courses, simulation or gaming, data processing equipment, team teaching, teacher aides or para-professionals, action learning, and early leaving plan. The least popular innovations were: SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, school-within-a-school, optional class attendance, and the extended school year -- all adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools in this category.

On the average, 10.5 of the thirty-three innovations in the study had been adopted by the schools in this category with an average of 4.9 fully implemented. As with the other categories of schools by location, the majority of innovations in the study had been adopted in 1970 or later. On the average 6.8 innovations per school had been adopted in 1970 or later, 3.3 between 1965 and 1969, and 0.5 prior to 1965.

Status of Innovations in Suburban Schools

Suburban schools accounted for 684 of the 3,271 schools returning usable questionnaires. Table XXVI illustrates that an average of 0.93 innovations had been abandoned after trial by the schools in this category. Those innovations most frequently reported abandoned were: team teaching, abandoned by 14.8 per cent of the schools; PSSC Physics, 11.3 per cent; humanities courses, 8.8 per cent; programmed instruction, 6.4 per cent; and flexible scheduling, 6.3 per cent. A total of eleven innovations had been abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of the responding schools. These innovations were: early leaving plan, action learning, extended school year, differentiated staffing, non-graded programs, simulation or gaming, SRSS Sociology, individual prescription of instruction, HSGP Geography, and career education.

Twelve of the selected innovations had been adopted by a majority of the schools. These were: PSSC Physics, humanities courses, career education, independent study programs, mini-courses, simulation or gaming, data processing equipment, team teaching, college credit courses, teacher aides and para-professionals, action learning, and early leaving plan. It will be noted that the most popular innovation, team teaching, had been adopted by 82 per cent of the schools in this category, but had also suffered the highest degree of abandonment, having been discontinued in 14.8 per cent of the schools.

Those innovations which proved to be least popular were: SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, and the extended school year -- all adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the responding schools. An average of 12.7 of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by the schools in this category, with an average of 11.7 in current use. This compares to the highest average of 13.3 per school in non-suburban communities of 200,000-299,999 residents. This is a departure from Cawelti's findings in which suburban schools reported the highest degree of adoption. However, Cawelti grouped schools in cities from 5,000-399,999 residents into

TABLE XXVI

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES WITHIN URBAN FRINGE OF CENTRAL CITY

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted					
									Before 1965		1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	77	11.3	333	48.8	204	29.9	69	10.1	65	18.5	218	62.1	68	19.4
Harvard Physics	13	1.9	494	72.2	127	18.6	50	7.3	4	2.1	77	40.5	109	57.4
ESCP Physical Science	15	2.2	550	80.4	87	12.7	32	4.7	6	4.5	77	57.5	51	38.1
SSSP Physical Science	10	1.5	653	95.6	7	1.0	13	1.9	1	3.4	12	41.4	16	55.2
IPS Physical Science	25	3.7	422	61.8	192	28.1	44	6.4	4	1.5	106	40.6	151	57.9
Humanities	60	8.8	314	46.0	240	35.1	69	10.1	28	7.6	212	57.6	128	34.8
Career Education	2	0.3	323	47.2	138	20.2	221	32.3	14	3.9	33	9.1	314	87.0
Independent Study Programs	16	2.3	150	22.0	226	33.1	291	42.6	13	2.4	149	28.0	371	69.6
Mini-Courses	30	4.4	295	43.2	193	28.3	165	24.2	6	1.6	90	23.3	291	75.2
Learning Packages	16	2.3	355	52.1	86	12.6	225	33.0	10	3.0	44	13.3	276	83.6
HSGP Geography	3	0.4	616	90.6	33	4.9	28	4.1	1	1.6	21	33.3	41	65.1
IPI	2	0.3	572	83.7	32	4.7	77	11.3	0	0.0	13	11.7	98	88.3
SRSS Sociology	1	0.1	622	91.1	28	4.1	32	4.7	1	1.6	21	34.4	39	63.9
Ethnic Studies	16	2.3	366	53.5	181	26.5	121	17.7	5	1.6	51	16.0	262	82.4
Television Instruction	27	3.9	496	72.5	59	8.6	102	14.9	13	6.9	56	29.6	120	63.5
Programmed Instruction	44	6.4	422	61.8	48	7.0	159	24.7	26	10.0	70	26.8	165	63.2
Teaching Machines	15	2.2	528	77.2	50	7.3	91	13.3	16	10.3	48	30.8	92	59.0
Telephone Amplification	8	1.2	585	85.7	25	3.7	65	9.5	7	7.1	17	17.3	74	75.5
Simulation or Gaming	3	0.4	164	24.0	202	29.5	315	46.1	8	1.5	85	16.3	429	82.2
Data Processing Equipment	24	3.5	148	21.7	445	65.2	65	9.5	63	11.8	339	63.2	134	25.0
Computer Assisted Instruction	8	1.2	343	50.1	225	32.9	108	15.8	5	1.5	103	30.3	232	68.2
Flexible Scheduling	43	6.3	530	77.7	84	12.3	25	3.7	9	5.9	73	47.7	71	46.4
Team Teaching	101	14.8	123	18.0	205	30.0	254	37.2	58	10.3	264	47.1	239	42.6
College Credit Courses	16	2.3	285	41.7	224	32.8	158	23.1	50	12.6	112	28.1	236	59.3
Non-Graded Programs	3	0.4	526	76.9	58	8.5	97	14.2	5	3.1	30	18.9	124	78.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	24	3.5	235	34.4	235	34.4	190	27.8	20	4.5	189	42.2	239	53.3
Differentiated Staffing	3	0.4	586	85.7	42	6.1	53	7.7	7	7.1	21	21.4	70	71.4
School-Within-A-School	9	1.3	608	88.9	36	5.3	31	4.5	8	10.4	22	28.6	47	61.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	5	0.7	518	75.7	67	9.8	94	13.7	11	6.7	45	27.4	108	65.9
Optional Class Attendance	10	1.5	613	89.6	13	1.9	48	7.0	0	0.0	10	14.1	61	85.9
Extended School Year	2	0.3	664	97.1	10	1.5	8	1.2	1	5.0	4	20.0	15	75.0
Action Learning	4	0.6	260	38.0	279	40.8	141	20.6	54	12.7	116	27.4	254	59.9
Early Leaving Plan	4	0.6	193	28.2	333	48.7	154	22.5	14	2.9	154	31.4	322	65.7
Total	639	2.8	13,892	61.6	4,414	19.6	3,605	16.0	533	6.2	2,882	33.3	5,247	60.6

one category. When this grouping is made with schools in this study, suburban schools outrank urban schools 12.7 to 12.4 innovations per school.

With the exception of schools in communities of over 400,000 residents, suburban schools reported the earliest adoption of the innovations in this study. A total of 39.5 per cent of the adopted innovations had been implemented prior to 1970. PSSC Physics, ESCP Physics, humanities courses, data processing equipment, and team teaching had been adopted by a majority of the schools reporting adoption prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Schools Located in Towns of Under 5,000 Residents

Schools located in small towns of under 5,000 residents made up the second largest group in this category. It will be noted that these schools along with those in rural areas showed both the lowest degree of adoption and the lowest degree of abandonment of all schools classified by size of community.

As illustrated in Table XXVII, the innovations reported suffering the highest degree of abandonment were team teaching and PSSC Physics, abandoned by 8.7 per cent and 7.5 per cent of the responding schools respectively. Conversely, the following innovations had been abandoned by fewer than 1 per cent of the reporting schools: Harvard Physics, ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, career education, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Socio-

TABLE XXVII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN TOWNS OF UNDER 5,000 RESIDENTS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully imple-mented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Year Adopted Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		Year Adopted 1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	56	7.5	561	75.1	80	10.7	50	6.7	6	3.2	124	66.0	58	30.9
Harvard Physics	1	0.1	650	86.9	63	8.4	34	4.5	0	0.0	35	36.1	62	63.9
ESCP Physical Science	7	0.9	655	87.7	59	7.9	26	3.5	1	1.1	44	48.9	45	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	3	0.4	725	97.3	11	1.5	6	0.8	2	10.0	10	50.0	8	40.0
IPS Physical Science	17	2.3	534	71.5	156	20.9	40	5.4	6	2.8	65	30.5	142	66.7
Humanities	35	4.7	543	72.7	124	16.6	45	6.0	6	2.9	117	57.4	81	39.7
Career Education	6	0.8	365	48.8	133	17.8	244	32.6	5	1.3	33	8.6	344	90.1
Independent Study Programs	17	2.3	335	44.8	141	18.9	255	34.1	11	2.7	82	19.9	319	77.4
Mini-Courses	14	1.9	401	53.8	162	21.7	169	22.7	2	0.6	65	18.7	280	80.7
Learning Packages	20	2.7	451	60.3	72	9.6	205	27.4	7	2.4	42	14.2	247	83.4
HSGP Geography	1	0.1	698	93.3	23	3.1	26	3.5	3	6.0	15	30.0	32	64.0
IPI	2	0.3	649	86.9	28	3.7	69	9.2	3	3.1	10	10.2	85	86.7
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	698	93.3	23	3.1	27	3.6	2	4.0	16	32.0	32	64.0
Ethnic Studies	8	1.1	546	73.0	88	11.8	106	14.2	1	0.5	17	8.4	184	91.1
Television Instruction	12	1.6	624	83.4	35	4.7	77	10.3	3	2.4	25	20.2	96	77.4
Programmed Instruction	21	2.8	513	68.6	50	6.7	162	21.7	14	6.0	49	20.9	171	73.1
Teaching Machines	6	0.8	618	82.6	43	5.7	81	10.8	6	4.6	40	30.8	84	64.6
Telephone Amplification	10	1.3	684	91.7	19	2.5	33	4.4	7	11.3	14	22.6	41	66.1
Simulation or Gaming	3	0.4	343	45.9	130	17.4	272	36.4	5	1.2	40	9.9	360	88.9
Data Processing Equipment	25	3.3	545	72.9	125	16.7	53	7.1	4	2.0	108	53.2	91	44.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	9	1.2	648	86.7	42	5.6	48	6.4	2	2.0	24	24.5	72	73.5
Flexible Scheduling	29	3.9	631	84.4	60	8.0	28	3.7	2	1.7	58	49.2	58	49.2
Team Teaching	65	8.7	406	54.4	77	10.3	169	26.6	11	3.2	117	34.3	213	62.5
College Credit Courses	7	0.9	551	73.8	65	8.7	124	16.6	7	3.6	31	15.7	159	80.7
Non-Graded Programs	4	0.5	633	84.7	29	3.9	81	10.8	1	0.9	20	17.5	93	81.6
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	26	3.5	351	47.1	169	22.7	200	26.8	11	2.8	153	38.6	232	58.6
Differentiated Staffing	1	0.1	683	91.3	22	2.9	42	5.6	6	9.2	11	16.9	48	73.8
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	741	99.1	3	0.4	4	0.5	1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4
Cultural Enrichment Program	3	0.4	628	84.0	44	5.9	73	9.8	10	8.3	24	20.0	86	71.7
Optional Class Attendance	2	0.3	709	94.8	8	1.1	29	3.9	1	2.6	6	15.4	32	82.1
Extended School Year	2	0.3	736	98.5	6	0.8	3	0.4	2	18.2	2	18.2	7	63.6
Action Learning	9	1.2	377	50.5	185	24.8	176	23.6	16	4.3	94	25.3	261	70.4
Early Leaving Plan	5	0.7	407	54.4	183	24.5	153	20.5	9	2.6	84	24.6	248	72.7
Total	426	1.7	18,639	75.6	2,458	10.0	3,140	12.7	173	2.9	1,576	26.2	4,276	71.0

logy, teaching machines, simulation or gaming, college credit courses, non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment programs, optional class attendance, extended school year, and early leaving plan. On the average, 0.57 innovations per school were reported abandoned.

Only four of the selected innovations had been adopted by a majority of the schools in this category -- career education, independent study programs, simulation or gaming, and teacher aides or para-professionals. Those innovations adopted by relatively few schools were the following adopted by fewer than 10 per cent of the schools: SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, telephone amplification, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, optional class attendance, and extended school year. An average of 8.1 innovations per school had been adopted by schools in this category although the majority (4.2) were being tried on a limited basis rather than having been fully implemented.

The schools in this category were among the last to adopt the innovations in this study. Only schools in rural areas reported later adoption. Only 29.1 per cent of the responding schools had made adoptions prior to 1970.

Status of Innovations in Rural Schools

Table XXVIII illustrates the status of the selected innovations in schools located in rural areas. These schools amounted to 12.8 per cent or 417 of the schools included in this study. These institutions reported an average of 0.55

innovations abandoned per school, with PSSC Physics and team teaching abandoned by the largest number of schools. Over half of the innovations in the study had suffered abandonment by fewer than 1 per cent of the schools responding. Of these, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, and the extended school year had been adopted by relatively few schools and had been abandoned by none.

As with the schools in the previous category, those in rural communities experienced only limited adoption of the innovations in the study. Only three innovations, independent study programs, simulation or gaming, and teacher aides or para-professionals had been adopted by a majority of the schools. Conversely, twenty-two of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by fewer than 25 per cent of the schools. An average of 7.7 innovations per school had been adopted with over half or 4.2 being tried on a limited basis only. Only schools in rural areas and those in communities of under 5,000 residents reported fewer innovations fully implemented than being tried on a limited basis.

Of all the schools classified by type of community, rural schools, on the average, were last to adopt the innovations in this study, with 72.1 per cent adopted in 1970 or later. Only PSSC Physics, flexible scheduling, data processing equipment, and teacher aides or para-professionals had been adopted prior to 1970 by a majority of those schools making the adoption.

TABLE XXVIII

STATUS OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS LOCATED IN RURAL AREAS

Innovation	Have tried but abandoned		Was never used		Fully implemented and operating		Being tried on limited basis		Before 1965		Year Adopted 1965-69		1970-1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	26	6.2	331	79.4	37	8.9	35	5.5	7	8.1	51	59.3	28	32.6
Harvard Physics	2	0.5	365	87.5	32	7.7	18	4.3	1	1.9	20	38.5	31	59.6
ESCP Physical Science	7	1.7	367	88.0	29	7.0	14	3.4	2	4.0	23	46.0	25	50.0
SSSP Physical Science	3	0.7	400	95.9	11	2.6	3	0.7	2	11.8	7	41.2	8	47.1
IPS Physical Science	9	2.2	314	75.3	77	18.5	17	4.1	2	1.9	40	38.8	61	59.2
Humanities	17	4.1	313	75.1	49	11.8	38	9.1	8	7.7	43	41.3	53	51.0
Career Education	1	0.2	213	51.2	63	15.1	139	33.4	3	1.5	18	8.9	181	89.6
Independent Study Programs	10	2.4	197	47.2	63	15.1	147	35.3	6	2.7	42	19.1	172	78.2
Mini-Courses	7	1.7	246	59.0	86	20.6	78	18.7	1	0.6	19	11.1	151	88.3
Learning Packages	7	1.7	263	63.1	36	8.6	111	26.6	3	1.9	16	10.4	135	87.7
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	398	95.4	10	2.4	9	2.2	3	15.8	3	15.8	13	68.4
IPI	2	0.5	370	88.7	12	2.9	33	7.9	0	0.0	5	10.6	42	89.4
SRSS Sociology	1	0.2	390	93.5	14	3.4	12	2.9	2	7.4	10	37.0	15	55.6
Ethnic Studies	1	0.2	328	78.8	39	9.4	48	11.5	0	0.0	7	8.0	81	92.0
Television Instruction	12	2.9	346	83.2	21	5.0	37	8.9	4	5.6	18	25.4	49	69.0
Programmed Instruction	11	2.6	300	71.9	26	6.2	80	19.2	6	5.1	28	23.9	83	70.9
Teaching Machines	11	2.6	338	81.1	24	5.8	44	10.6	4	4.1	26	32.9	49	62.0
Telephone Amplification	2	0.5	393	94.5	6	1.4	15	3.6	1	4.2	4	16.7	19	79.2
Simulation or Gaming	2	0.5	196	47.0	67	16.1	152	36.5	1	0.5	16	7.2	204	92.3
Data Processing Equipment	14	3.4	294	70.5	73	17.5	36	8.6	1	0.8	66	53.7	56	45.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	1	0.2	371	89.0	16	3.8	29	7.0	0	0.0	6	12.8	41	87.2
Flexible Scheduling	16	3.8	346	83.2	43	10.3	11	2.6	1	1.4	39	54.9	31	43.7
Team Teaching	34	8.2	235	56.4	46	11.0	102	24.5	5	2.7	71	39.0	106	58.2
College Credit Courses	3	0.7	317	76.0	27	6.5	70	16.8	1	1.0	13	13.0	86	86.0
Non-Graded Programs	4	1.0	351	84.2	15	3.6	47	11.3	2	3.0	7	10.4	58	86.6
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	14	3.4	190	45.6	112	26.9	101	24.2	6	2.6	110	48.5	111	48.9
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	374	89.7	16	3.8	27	6.5	2	4.7	4	9.3	37	86.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0	411	98.6	3	0.7	3	0.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	6	85.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	3	0.7	343	82.3	20	4.8	51	12.2	6	8.1	11	14.9	57	77.0
Optional Class Attendance	1	0.2	396	95.0	2	0.5	18	4.3	0	0.0	1	4.8	20	95.2
Extended School Year	0	0.0	402	96.4	12	2.9	3	0.7	0	0.0	3	20.0	12	80.0
Action Learning	5	1.2	211	50.6	86	20.6	115	27.6	3	1.5	42	20.4	161	78.2
Early Leaving Plan	3	0.7	228	54.7	82	19.7	104	24.9	3	1.6	42	22.2	144	76.2
Total	229	1.7	10.537	76.6	1.255	9.1	1,735	12.6	87	2.7	811	25.2	2,326	72.1

Adoption of Innovations in Responding Schools

Tables XXIX and XXX illustrate the adoption of the thirty-three innovations in all responding schools. Just as the Cawelti study reported, the schools included in this study reported greater adoption of curriculum innovations than innovations in technology or organization. Of the fourteen curriculum innovations in the study, PSSC Physics, IPS Physical Science, humanities courses, learning packages, and ethnic studies had been adopted by at least 25 per cent of the schools. Career education, mini-courses, and independent study programs were reported as adopted by at least 50 per cent of the schools.

Of the seven innovations in technology, programmed instruction and computer assisted instruction had been adopted by more than 25 per cent of the responding schools, while more than 50 per cent of the schools had adopted simulation or gaming and data processing equipment.

Organizational innovations accounted for the second largest group of adoptions. Of the twelve included in the study, college credit courses had been adopted by 42.4 per cent of the schools. Team teaching, the use of teacher aides or para-professionals, action learning and early leaving plans had been adopted by more than 50 per cent of the schools.

The median adoption of innovations in all three cate-

TABLE XXIX

INNOVATIONS REPORTED ADOPTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	f		%
PSSC Physics	1,228		37.5
Harvard Physics	623		19.0
ESCP Physical Science	543		16.6
SSSP Physical Science	144		4.4
IPS Physical Science	1,045		31.9
Humanities Courses	1,299		39.7
Career Education	1,696		51.8
Independent Study Programs	2,078		63.5
Mini-Courses	1,679		51.3
Learning Packages	1,440		44.0
HSGP Geography	250		7.6
IPI	477		14.6
SRSS Sociology	278		8.5
Ethnic Studies	1,359		41.5
Television Instruction	764		23.4
Programmed Instruction	1,155		35.3
Teaching Machines	694		21.2
Telephone Amplification	326		10.0
Simulation or Gaming	2,100		64.2
Data Processing Equipment	1,772		54.2
Computer Assisted Instruction	979		29.9
Flexible Scheduling	600		18.3
Team Teaching	2,112		64.6
College Credit Courses	1,388		42.4
Non-Graded Programs	621		19.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2,019		61.7
Differentiated Staffing	399		12.2
School-Within-A-School	177		5.4
Cultural Enrichment Programs	734		22.4
Optional Class Attendance	260		7.9
Extended School Year	79		2.4
Action Learning	1,864		57.0
Early Leaving Plan	1,911		58.4
Total	34,093		
Mean		9.7	31.6
Median			29.9

gories was 29.9 per cent of the responding schools. Curriculum innovations accounted for 41.5 per cent of adoptions, technological innovations amounted to 22.8 per cent and organizational innovations amounted to 35.7 per cent.

TABLE XXX

ADOPTION OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION OF CURRICULUM, TECHNOLOGY, AND ORGANIZATION

Category	f	%
Curriculum	14,141	41.5
Technology	7,790	22.8
Organization	12,164	35.7
Total	34,095	100.0

Abandonment of Innovations by Responding Schools

As illustrated in Tables XXXI and XXXII, an average of .76 innovations in this study had been abandoned per school, or less than half the abandonment per school reported by Cawelti in his study. The median abandonment of innovations in all three categories was 1.4 per cent of the responding schools. Curriculum innovations accounted for 44.6 per cent of abandonment; technological innovations, 21.3 per cent; and organizational innovations, 34.2 per cent.

TABLE XXXI

INNOVATIONS REPORTED ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	304	9.3
Harvard Physics	37	1.1
ESCP Physical Science	58	1.8
SSSP Physical Science	24	0.7
IPS Physical Science	105	3.2
Humanities Courses	211	6.5
Career Education	18	0.6
Independent Study Programs	92	2.8
Mini-Courses	99	3.0
Learning Packages	67	2.1
HSGP Geography	14	0.4
IPI	8	0.2
SRSS Sociology	7	0.2
Ethnic Studies	60	1.8
Television Instruction	121	3.7
Programmed Instruction	138	4.2
Teaching Machines	59	1.8
Telephone Amplification	33	1.0
Simulation or Gaming	18	0.6
Data Processing Equipment	112	3.4
Computer Assisted Instruction	46	1.4
Flexible Scheduling	146	4.5
Team Teaching	389	11.9
College Credit Courses	60	1.8
Non-Graded Programs	15	0.5
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	106	3.2
Differentiated Staffing	9	0.3
School-Within-A-School	19	0.6
Cultural Enrichment Programs	24	0.7
Optional Class Attendance	27	0.8
Extended School Year	8	0.2
Action Learning	24	0.7
Early Leaving Plan	19	0.6
Total	2,477	
Mean		.76 2.3
Median		1.4

TABLE XXXII

ABANDONMENT OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION OF CURRICULUM, TECHNOLOGY, AND ORGANIZATION

Category	f	%
Curriculum	1,104	44.6
Technology	527	21.3
Organization	846	34.2
Total	2,477	100.1

Adoption and Abandonment of Innovations by Percent of Schools Reporting Adoption and/or Abandonment

The data in Tables XXXIII and XXXIV illustrate the adoption and abandonment of the thirty-three selected innovations by percent of schools reporting adoption and/or abandonment. Sixteen innovations were reported adopted by fewer than 25 per cent of responding schools. Of these, six were curricular: Harvard Physics, ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, and SRSS Sociology; three were technological: television instruction, teaching machines, and telephone amplification; and seven were organizational: flexible scheduling, non-graded programs, differentiated staffing, school-within-a-school, cultural enrichment programs, optional class attendance, and extended school year.

Adoption ranging from 25 per cent to 49 per cent of responding schools was reported for PSSC Physics, IPS Physical Science, humanities courses, learning packages, ethnic studies, programmed instruction, computer assisted instruction, and college credit courses.

The most widely adopted innovations were: team teaching in 64.6 per cent of responding schools; simulation or gaming, 64.2 per cent; independent study programs, 63.5 per cent; teacher aides or para-professionals, 61.7 per cent; early leaving plan, 58.4 per cent; action learning, 57 per cent; data processing equipment, 54.2 per cent; career education, 51.8 per cent; and mini-courses, 51.3 per cent.

The majority of innovations in this study had suffered relatively low incidence of abandonment with abandonment of twenty-three reported by fewer than 3 per cent of responding schools. The next largest group included: IPS Physical Science, mini-courses, television instruction, programmed instruction, data processing equipment, flexible scheduling, and teacher aides or para-professionals -- all reported abandoned by 3 - 4.9 per cent of responding schools. PSSC Physics and humanities courses had been abandoned by 9.3 per cent and 6.5 per cent of responding schools respectively. Team teaching suffered the highest degree of abandonment at 11.9 per cent.

TABLE XXXIII

INNOVATIONS ADOPTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY PERCENT OF SCHOOLS REPORTING ADOPTION

Innovation	Adopted by fewer than 25%		Adopted by 25%-49%		Adopted by 50%-75%	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics			1228	37.5		
Harvard Physics	623	19.0				
ESCP Physical Science	543	16.6				
SSSP Physical Science	144	4.4				
IPS Physical Science			1045	31.9		
Humanities Course			1299	39.7		
Career Education					1696	51.8
Independent Study Programs					2078	63.5
Mini-Courses					1679	51.3
Learning Packages			1440	44.0		
HSGP Geography	250	7.6				
IPI	477	14.6				
SRSS Sociology	278	8.5				
Ethnic Studies			1359	41.5		
Television Instruction	764	23.4				
Programmed Instruction			1155	35.3		
Teaching Machines	694	21.2				
Telephone Amplification	326	10.0				
Simulation or Gaming					2100	64.2
Data Processing Equipment					1772	54.2
Computer Assisted Instruction			979	29.9		
Flexible Scheduling	600	18.3				
Team Teaching					2112	64.6
College Credit Courses			1388	42.4		
Non-Graded Programs	621	19.0				
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals					2019	61.7
Differentiated Staffing	399	12.2				
School-Within-A-School	177	5.4				
Cultural Enrichment Programs	734	22.4				
Optional Class Attendance	260	7.9				
Extended School Year	79	2.4				
Action Learning					1864	57.0
Early Leaving Plan					1911	58.4

TABLE XXXIV

INNOVATIONS ABANDONED FOLLOWING ADOPTION BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY PERCENT OF SCHOOLS REPORTING ABANDONMENT

Innovation	Abandoned by 0 - 2.9%		Abandoned by 3 - 4.9%		Abandoned by 5 - 10%		Abandoned by more than 10%	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics					304	9.3		
Harvard Physics	37	1.1						
ESCP Physical Science	58	1.8						
SSSP Physical Science	24	.7						
IPS Physical Science			105	3.2				
Humanities Course					211	6.5		
Career Education	18	.6						
Independent Study Programs	92	2.8						
Mini-Courses			99	3.0				
Learning Packages	67	2.0						
HSGP Geography	14	.4						
IPI	8	.2						
SRSS Sociology	7	.2						
Ethnic Studies	60	1.8						
Television Instruction			121	3.7				
Programmed Instruction			138	4.2				
Teaching Machines	59	1.8						
Telephone Amplification	33	1.0						
Simulation or Gaming	18	.6						
Data Processing Equipment			112	3.4				
Computer Assisted Instruction	46	1.4						
Flexible Scheduling			146	4.5				
Team Teaching							389	11.9
College Credit Courses	60	1.8						
Non-Graded Programs	15	.5						
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals			106	3.2				
Differentiated Staffing	9	.3						
School-Within-A-School	19	.6						
Cultural Enrichment Program	24	.7						
Optional Class Attendance	27	.8						
Extended School Year	8	.2						
Action Learning	24	.7						
Early Leaving Plan	19	.6						

Adoption and Abandonment of Innovations in Order of Relative Frequency

Tables XXXV and XXXVI illustrate the adoption and abandonment of the innovations in this study in order of relative frequency. Adoption by more than 50 per cent of responding schools was reported for the following innovations: team teaching, 64.6 per cent; simulation or gaming, 64.2 per cent; independent study programs, 63.5 per cent; teacher aides or para-professionals, 61.7 per cent; early leaving plan, 58.4 per cent; action learning, 57 per cent; data processing equipment, 54.2 per cent; career education, 51.8 per cent; and mini-courses, 51.3 per cent.

The following practices were in evidence the least in the schools in the study: television instruction, cultural enrichment programs, teaching machines, Harvard Physics, non-graded programs, flexible scheduling, ESCP Physical Science, individual prescription of instruction, differentiated staffing, telephone amplification, SRSS Sociology, optional class attendance, HSGP Geography, school-within-a-school, SSSP Physical Science, and extended school year. For purposes of comparison with Cawelti's study, these practices had been adopted by fewer than 25 per cent of the responding schools -- Cawelti's arbitrary adoption limit differentiating between innovations and non-innovations.

Abandonment of innovations in the study reported by responding schools, ranged from .2 per cent to 11.9 per cent of the schools. On the average .76 innovations per school were

TABLE XXXV

ADOPTION OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN ORDER OF RELATIVE FREQUENCY

Innovation	f	%
Team Teaching	2,112	64.6
Simulation or Gaming	2,100	64.2
Independent Study Programs	2,078	63.5
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2,019	61.7
Early Leaving Plan	1,911	58.4
Action Learning	1,864	57.0
Data Processing Equipment	1,772	54.2
Career Education	1,696	51.8
Mini-Courses	1,679	51.3
Learning Packages	1,440	44.0
College Credit Courses	1,388	42.4
Ethnic Studies	1,359	41.5
Humanities Courses	1,299	39.7
PSSC Physics	1,228	37.5
Programmed Instruction	1,155	35.3
IPS Physical Science	1,045	31.9
Computer Assisted Instruction	979	29.9
Television Instruction	764	23.4
Cultural Enrichment Program	734	22.4
Teaching Machines	694	21.2
Harvard Physics	623	19.0
Non-Graded Programs	621	19.0
Flexible Scheduling	600	18.3
ESCP Physical Science	543	16.6
IPI	477	14.6
Differentiated Staffing	399	12.2
Telephone Amplification	326	10.0
SRSS Sociology	278	8.5
Optional Class Attendance	260	7.9
HSGP Geography	250	7.6
School-Within-A-School	177	5.4
SSSP Physical Science	144	4.4
Extended School Year	79	2.4

TABLE XXXVI

ABANDONMENT OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN ORDER OF RELATIVE FREQUENCY

Innovation	f	%
Team Teaching	389	11.9
PSSC Physics	304	9.3
Humanities Courses	211	6.5
Flexible Scheduling	146	4.5
Programmed Instruction	138	4.2
Television Instruction	121	3.7
Data Processing Equipment	112	3.4
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	106	3.2
IPS Physical Science	105	3.2
Mini-Courses	99	3.0
Independent Study Programs	92	2.8
Learning Packages	67	2.1
Ethnic Studies	60	1.8
College Credit Courses	60	1.8
Teaching Machines	59	1.8
ESCP Physical Science	58	1.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	46	1.4
Harvard Physics	37	1.1
Telephone Amplification	33	1.0
Optional Class Attendance	27	.8
SSSP Physical Science	24	.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	24	.7
Action Learning	24	.7
School-Within-A-School	19	.6
Early Leaving Plan	19	.6
Career Education	18	.6
Simulation or Gaming	18	.6
Non-Graded Programs	15	.5
HSGP Geography	14	.4
Differentiated Staffing	9	.3
IPI	8	.2
Extended School Year	8	.2
SRSS Sociology	7	.2

reported abandoned -- or less than half the number reported abandoned per school in the Cawelti study. The innovation suffering highest abandonment was team teaching, abandoned by 389 schools.

Average Number of Innovations Adopted or Abandoned by Responding Schools

Tables XXXVII - XL illustrate the average number of innovations adopted and/or abandoned by responding schools by enrollment, per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes, source of support, and type of community in which the school is located.

An average of 10.9 innovations had been adopted by responding schools by enrollment, with schools of over 2,500 pupils reporting the highest adoption with an average of 14.6 per school. Abandonment averaged .81 innovations per school, with schools of over 2,500 pupils also reporting highest abandonment with .99 innovations per school.

Adoption by responding schools by per-pupil expenditure for instruction purposes averaged 10.9 innovations per school with schools of the highest per-pupil expenditure reporting the largest average adoption (14.5 per school). As with schools in the previous category, those reporting the highest adoption also reported the highest abandonment with .83 innovations per school reported abandoned by schools with expenditures of over $1,500 per pupil.

An average of 11.9 innovations per school were reported adopted by responding schools by source of support. Government supported schools reported highest adoption with an average of 12.9. Private, not religious affiliated schools reported the highest abandonment with an average of 1.36 per school.

Among schools classified by the type of community in which they are located, an average of 11.3 innovations had been adopted per school. Schools located in communities of 200,000-299,999 residents reported the highest average number of innovations adopted with 13.3 per school. Schools in the same category also reported highest abandonment with an average of 1.10 reported per school.

TABLE XXXVII

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS REPORTED ADOPTED AND/OR ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY ENROLLMENT

Enrollment	Average Number Adopted	Average Number Abandoned
Fewer than 200	7.8	0.76
200-499	8.1	0.64
500-1,499	10.2	0.74
1,500-2,499	13.9	0.92
Over 2,500	14.6	0.99
Mean	10.9	0.81

TABLE XXXVIII

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS REPORTED ADOPTED AND/OR ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY PER-PUPIL EXPENDITURE

Per-Pupil Expenditure	Average Number Adopted	Average Number Abandoned
Less than $500	8.6	0.68
$500-$799	9.2	0.69
$800-$1,500	11.2	0.82
Over $1,500	14.5	0.83
Mean	10.9	0.76

TABLE XXXIX

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS ADOPTED AND/OR ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY SOURCE OF SUPPORT

Source of Support	Average Number Adopted	Average Number Abandoned
Public	10.2	0.72
Parochial or Diocesan	12.5	1.07
Private, Religious Affiliated	11.9	1.21
Private, Not Religious Affiliated	12.2	1.05
Government	12.9	1.05
Mean	11.9	0.88

TABLE XL

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS ADOPTED AND/OR ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED

Type of Community	Average Number Adopted	Average Number Abandoned
City of Over 400,000 (Not Suburban)	13.2	1.08
300,000-399,999 (Not Suburban)	12.4	0.84
200,000-299,999 (Not Suburban)	13.3	1.10
100,000-199,999 (Not Suburban)	12.7	0.71
5,000-99,999 (Not Suburban)	10.5	0.76
Suburban-Within-Urban Fringe of Central City	12.7	0.93
Small Town of Under 5,000	8.1	0.57
Rural	7.7	0.55
Mean	11.3	0.82

Year of Adoption of Innovations

As Table XLI illustrates, the majority of adoptions of the thirty-three innovations included in this study came after 1970. Only PSSC Physics, ESCP Physical Science, humanities courses, the use of data processing equipment, and flexible

TABLE XLI

YEAR OF ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	Before 1965		1965 - 1969		1970 - 1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	179	14.5	767	62.3	285	23.2
Harvard Physics	8	1.3	242	38.9	372	59.8
ESCP Physical Science	19	3.5	274	50.6	248	45.8
SSSP Physical Science	9	6.3	63	43.8	72	50.0
IPS Physical Science	28	2.7	348	33.2	671	64.1
Humanities	79	6.1	687	52.9	532	41.0
Career Education	55	3.2	143	8.4	1,496	88.3
Independent Study Programs	54	2.6	486	23.4	1,535	74.0
Mini-Courses	12	0.7	330	19.6	1,339	79.7
Learning Packages	27	1.9	218	15.1	1,194	83.0
HSGP Geography	13	5.2	83	33.2	154	61.6
IPI	9	1.9	47	9.9	419	88.2
SRSS Sociology	10	3.6	96	34.5	172	61.9
Ethnic Studies	16	1.2	206	15.2	1,135	83.6
Television Instruction	57	7.5	193	25.2	515	67.3
Programmed Instruction	80	6.9	281	24.3	796	68.8
Teaching Machines	55	7.9	206	29.7	433	62.4
Telephone Amplification	23	7.0	75	22.8	231	70.2
Simulation or Gaming	32	1.5	267	12.7	1,802	85.8
Data Processing Equipment	154	8.7	1,058	59.5	565	31.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	10	1.0	263	26.9	704	72.1
Flexible Scheduling	21	3.5	297	48.9	289	47.6
Team Teaching	152	7.2	903	42.8	1,056	50.0
College Credit Courses	160	11.5	326	23.4	905	65.1
Non-Graded Programs	18	2.9	105	16.9	500	60.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	69	3.4	921	45.6	1,029	51.0
Differentiated Staffing	32	8.0	78	19.5	289	72.4
School-Within-A-School	19	10.6	43	24.0	117	65.4
Cultural Enrichment Programs	63	8.6	156	21.3	514	70.1
Optional Class Attendance	4	1.5	45	17.2	212	81.2
Extended School Year	7	8.9	17	21.5	55	69.6
Action Learning	194	10.4	489	26.2	1,184	63.4
Early Leaving Plan	97	5.1	514	26.9	1,300	68.0
Total	1,765	5.2	10,227	30.0	22,120	64.8

TABLE XLII

YEAR OF ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS REPORTED ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	Before 1965		1965 - 1969		1970 - 1974	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	59	19.4	224	73.7	21	6.9
Harvard Physics	2	5.4	26	70.3	9	24.3
ESCP Physical Science	6	10.5	43	73.7	9	15.8
SSSP Physical Science	2	8.7	20	82.6	2	8.7
IPS Physical Science	4	3.9	82	77.7	19	18.4
Humanities	19	9.1	142	67.9	50	23.0
Career Education	3	16.7	9	50.0	6	33.3
Independent Study Programs	5	5.4	61	66.3	26	28.3
Mini-Courses	1	1.0	58	58.6	40	40.4
Learning Packages	4	6.0	39	58.2	24	35.8
HSGP Geography	2	15.4	10	69.2	2	15.4
IPI	0	0.0	6	75.0	2	25.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	7	100.0	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	0	0.0	38	63.3	22	36.7
Television Instruction	32	26.7	84	69.2	5	4.2
Programmed Instruction	37	27.0	91	66.4	10	6.6
Teaching Machines	19	32.2	39	66.1	1	1.7
Telephone Amplification	5	15.2	25	75.8	3	9.1
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0	9	50.0	9	50.0
Data Processing Equipment	9	8.1	83	78.4	15	13.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0	32	68.9	14	31.1
Flexible Scheduling	7	4.8	119	81.5	20	13.7
Team Teaching	47	12.1	282	74.2	54	13.7
College Credit Courses	12	20.3	40	66.1	8	13.6
Non-Graded Programs	1	6.7	11	73.3	3	20.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	5	4.7	84	79.2	17	16.0
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	7	77.8	2	22.2
School-Within-A-School	3	15.8	14	73.7	2	10.5
Cultural Enrichment Programs	2	8.7	18	73.9	4	17.4
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0	19	70.4	8	29.6
Extended School Year	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
Action Learning	0	0.0	14	58.3	10	41.7
Early Leaving Plan	2	10.5	12	63.2	5	26.3
Total	289	11.7	1,765	71.2	423	17.0

scheduling had been adopted by a majority of schools prior to 1970. Team teaching had been adopted by exactly 50 per cent of responding schools prior to 1970. Overall, the time required for diffusion and adoption of the majority of innovations in this study was less than half that reported necessary by Mort.

Table XLII illustrates that of innovations reported abandoned, the majority had been adopted prior to 1970, with 71.2 per cent having been adopted between 1965 and 1969. Exactly 50 per cent of abandoned simulation or gaming programs had been adopted prior to 1970.

Number of Innovations Reported Never Adopted by Responding Schools

Table XLIII illustrates that on the average, the innovations in this study were reported as never having been adopted by 68.4 per cent of the responding schools. In terms of the number of innovations, an average of 23.3 of the thirty-three reported never adopted. Over 75 per cent of the schools reported no adoption of sixteen of the innovations with the extended school year, optional class attendance, school-within-a-school, SRSS Sociology, HSGP Geography, and SSSP Physical Science reported as having never been adopted by 90 per cent or more of the schools.

TABLE XLIII

INNOVATIONS REPORTED NEVER ADOPTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	2,040	62.4
Harvard Physics	2,643	80.8
ESCP Physical Science	2,727	83.4
SSSP Physical Science	3,122	95.4
IPS Physical Science	2,222	67.9
Humanities Courses	1,966	60.1
Career Education	1,568	47.9
Independent Study Programs	1,189	36.3
Mini-Courses	1,586	48.5
Learning Packages	1,825	55.8
HSGP Geography	3,014	92.1
IPI	2,788	85.2
SRSS Sociology	2,990	91.4
Ethnic Studies	1,911	58.4
Television Instruction	2,505	76.6
Programmed Instruction	2,113	64.6
Teaching Machines	2,577	78.8
Telephone Amplification	2,941	89.9
Simulation or Gaming	1,169	35.7
Data Processing Equipment	1,492	45.6
Computer Assisted Instruction	2,290	70.0
Flexible Scheduling	2,667	81.5
Team Teaching	1,157	35.4
College Credit Courses	1,880	57.5
Non-Graded Programs	2,649	81.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	1,250	38.2
Differentiated Staffing	2,872	87.8
School-Within-A-School	3,093	94.6
Cultural Enrichment Program	2,536	77.5
Optional Class Attendance	3,008	92.0
Extended School Year	3,191	97.6
Action Learning	1,403	42.9
Early Leaving Plan	1,358	41.5
Total	73,742	68.4

Individuals, Organizations and Groups Influencing Adoption of Innovations Abandoned After Trial

Tables XLIV - XLV illustrate the persons, groups or organizations which provide the impetus for adoption of the innovations included in this study which were reported abandoned after trial. It will be noted that administrators influenced the adoption of the innovations most, followed by teachers, students and parents combined. Boards of education, the North Central Association, government agencies, state departments of education, publishing companies, and the results of educational research had relatively little impact upon adoption.

Extent of Influence of Administrators Upon Adoption

As shown in Table XLIV principals, other building administrators (administrative assistants, assistant principals, etc.), superintendents, and directors of curriculum or instruction played the most prominent role in the adoption of PSSC Physics, humanities courses, television instruction, programmed instruction, the use of data processing equipment, flexible scheduling, team teaching, and the use of teacher aides and para-professionals. With the exception of only a few innovations, particularly Harvard Physics and ethnic studies, the influence of administrators in the adoption of the abandoned innovations generally equalled or exceeded that of teachers, students, and parents as a group.

TABLE XLIV

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATED IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	Impetus for Adoption Influenced by Administrators	
	f	%
PSSC Physics	133	7.4
Harvard Physics	12	0.7
ESCP Physical Science	36	2.0
SSSP Physical Science	13	0.7
IPS Physical Science	55	3.1
Humanities Courses	129	7.2
Career Education	6	0.3
Independent Study Programs	73	4.1
Mini-Courses	86	4.8
Learning Packages	46	2.6
HSGP Geography	5	0.3
IPI	5	0.3
SRSS Sociology	3	0.2
Ethnic Studies	41	2.3
Television Instruction	122	6.8
Programmed Instruction	100	5.6
Teaching Machines	45	2.5
Telephone Amplification	17	0.9
Simulation or Gaming	10	0.6
Data Processing Equipment	107	6.0
Computer Assisted Instruction	35	1.9
Flexible Scheduling	177	9.9
Team Teaching	300	16.7
College Credit Courses	37	2.1
Non-Graded Programs	10	0.6
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	84	4.7
Differentiated Staffing	9	0.5
School-Within-A-School	22	1.2
Cultural Enrichment Programs	15	0.8
Optional Class Attendance	24	1.3
Extended School Year	8	0.4
Action Learning	16	0.9
Early Leaving Plan	15	0.8
Total	1,796	100.2

Extent of Influence of Teachers, Parents and Students Upon Adoption

Teachers, students, and parents combined created an impact upon the adoption of innovations later abandoned, second only to that of administrators. As shown in Table XLV, this group which traditionally is the first to be affected by change or innovation, played a greater role than administrators in influencing the adoption of PSSC Physics, Harvard Physics, humanities courses, HSGP Geography, ethnic studies, simulation and gaming, college credit courses, optional class attendance, and early leaving plans. In the case of ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, IPS Physical Science, career education, independent study programs, mini-courses, learning packages, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, programmed instruction, computer assisted instruction, and action learning, this group's influence was roughly equal to that of administrators.

Extent of Influence of Boards of Education Upon Adoption

Boards of education in districts included in this study apparently exerted relatively little impact upon the adoption of innovations later abandoned. As Table XLVI shows, that influence exerted was confined mainly to technological and organizational innovations including television instruction, the use of data processing equipment, flexible scheduling, and the utilization of teacher aides or para-professionals. PSSC Physics was the only curricular innovation whose adoption was influenced to any degree by boards of education,

TABLE XLV

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS PARTICIPATED IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	217	14.6
Harvard Physics	23	1.5
ESCP Physical Science	35	2.4
SSSP Physical Science	12	0.8
IPS Physical Science	53	3.6
Humanities Courses	179	12.1
Career Education	6	0.4
Independent Study Programs	67	4.5
Mini-Courses	77	5.2
Learning Packages	42	2.8
HSGP Geography	9	0.6
IPI	1	0.1
SRSS Sociology	3	0.2
Ethnic Studies	68	4.6
Television Instruction	49	3.3
Programmed Instruction	96	6.5
Teaching Machines	17	1.1
Telephone Amplification	11	0.7
Simulation or Gaming	12	0.8
Data Processing Equipment	11	0.7
Computer Assisted Instruction	30	2.0
Flexible Scheduling	87	5.9
Team Teaching	222	15.0
College Credit Courses	40	2.7
Non-Graded Programs	4	0.3
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	24	1.6
Differentiated Staffing	3	0.2
School-Within-A-School	10	0.7
Cultural Enrichment Programs	9	0.6
Optional Class Attendance	34	2.3
Extended School Year	2	0.1
Action Learning	12	0.8
Early Leaving Plan	19	1.3
Total	1,484	99.2

TABLE XLVI

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH BOARDS OF EDUCATION PARTICIPATED IN THE IMPETUS OF ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	11	9.1
Harvard Physics	0	0.0
ESCP Physical Science	2	1.7
SSSP Physical Science	2	1.7
IPS Physical Science	1	0.8
Humanities Courses	4	3.3
Career Education	0	0.0
Independent Study Programs	2	1.7
Mini-Courses	1	0.8
Learning Packages	1	0.8
HSGP Geography	0	0.0
IPI	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	5	4.1
Television Instruction	26	21.5
Programmed Instruction	0	0.0
Teaching Machines	4	3.3
Telephone Amplification	3	2.5
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0
Data Processing Equipment	11	9.1
Computer Assisted Instruction	2	1.7
Flexible Scheduling	11	9.1
Team Teaching	7	5.8
College Credit Courses	1	0.8
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	13	10.7
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	2	1.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	2	1.7
Optional Class Attendance	3	2.5
Extended School Year	1	0.8
Action Learning	4	3.3
Early Leaving Plan	2	1.7
Total	121	100.2

with such influence reported by eleven schools. Television instruction was the innovation most strongly influenced by boards of education with twenty-six schools reporting boards playing a role in adoption.

Extent of Influence of State Departments of Education, Regional Accrediting Agency and Federal Government Agencies Upon Adoption.

Agencies outside the school district including state departments of education, the North Central Association, and federal government agencies ranked fourth in providing the impetus for the adoption of innovations later abandoned. In the adoption of only three innovations did ten or more responding schools report the impetus for such adoption arising from the above outside agencies. Such influence was reported in the adoption of PSSC Physics by seventeen schools; television instruction by twelve schools; and humanities courses by ten schools. In the case of career education, HSGP Geography, individual prescription of instruction, SRSS Sociology, simulation or gaming, differentiated staffing and school-within-a-school programs, none of the abandoned innovations had been adopted because of direct impetus from state departments of education, the North Central Association, or agencies of the federal government.

Extent of Influence of Publishing and Media Companies Upon Adoption

Publishing and media companies were reported to have had the least influence upon the adoption of innovations

TABLE XLVII

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, REGIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCY, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES PARTICIPATED IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	17	16.2
Harvard Physics	2	1.9
ESCP Physical Science	3	2.9
SSSP Physical Science	1	1.0
IPS Physical Science	3	2.9
Humanities Courses	10	9.5
Career Education	0	0.0
Independent Study Programs	4	3.8
Mini-Courses	1	1.0
Learning Packages	1	1.0
HSGP Geography	0	0.0
IPI	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	4	3.8
Television Instruction	12	11.4
Programmed Instruction	6	5.7
Teaching Machines	2	1.9
Telephone Amplification	1	1.0
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0
Data Processing Equipment	3	2.9
Computer Assisted Instruction	3	2.9
Flexible Scheduling	5	4.8
Team Teaching	5	4.8
College Credit Courses	1	1.0
Non-Graded Programs	2	1.9
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	7	6.7
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	6	5.7
Optional Class Attendance	1	1.0
Extended School Year	2	1.9
Action Learning	2	1.9
Early Leaving Plan	1	1.0
Total	105	100.3

later abandoned. The adoption of PSSC Physics was reported by ten schools to have been influenced by publishing and media companies while programmed instruction was reported by five schools. Other innovations had been adopted as a result of impetus from publishing and media companies by four or fewer schools. The majority of abandoned innovations in this study were reported to have been adopted completely apart from any influence of these companies.

Extent of Influence of the Results of Educational Research Upon Adoption

Table XLIX seems to bear out the contention made in Chapter II that, at least in the case of innovations later abandoned, the results of educational research do not play a major role in the adoption of new practices. With the exception of PSSC Physics and team teaching, no more than six schools reported that abandoned innovations were first adopted as a result of impetus from educational research. Twelve of the innovations (most of them in the area of organization) were reported to have not been influenced at all by the results of educational research.

Extent of Influence of Other Varied Individuals, Groups and Agencies Upon Adoption

In addition to those previously mentioned, other varied individuals, groups and agencies played a role in the adoption of innovations, included in this study, which were later abandoned. This category included: department chairmen, subject area coordinators, consultants, human relations

TABLE XLVIII

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH PUBLISHING AND MEDIA COMPANIES PARTICIPATED IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	10	25.6
Harvard Physics	1	2.6
ESCP Physical Science	2	5.1
SSSP Physical Science	1	2.6
IPS Physical Science	4	10.3
Humanities Courses	0	0.0
Career Education	0	0.0
Independent Study Programs	0	0.0
Mini-Courses	0	0.0
Learning Packages	4	10.3
HSGP Geography	1	2.6
IPI	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	2	5.1
Television Instruction	1	2.6
Programmed Instruction	5	12.8
Teaching Machines	2	5.1
Telephone Amplification	1	2.6
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0
Data Processing Equipment	1	2.6
Computer Assisted Instruction	0	0.0
Flexible Scheduling	0	0.0
Team Teaching	3	7.7
College Credit Courses	1	2.6
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	0	0.0
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0
Action Learning	0	0.0
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0
Total	39	100.2

TABLE XLIX

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE RESULTS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH PLAYED A ROLE IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	12	18.2
Harvard Physics	2	3.0
ESCP Physical Science	2	3.0
SSSP Physical Science	1	1.5
IPS Physical Science	3	4.5
Humanities Courses	4	6.1
Career Education	0	0.0
Independent Study Programs	3	4.5
Mini-Courses	2	3.0
Learning Packages	2	3.0
HSGP Geography	0	0.0
IPI	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	1	1.5
Television Instruction	4	6.1
Programmed Instruction	0	0.0
Teaching Machines	2	3.0
Telephone Amplification	2	3.0
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0
Data Processing Equipment	2	3.0
Computer Assisted Instruction	1	1.5
Flexible Scheduling	6	9.1
Team Teaching	13	19.7
College Credit Courses	1	1.5
Non-Graded Programs	1	1.5
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	1	1.5
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	1	1.5
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0
Action Learning	0	0.0
Early Leaving Plan	0	0.0
Total	66	99.7

counselors, guidance directors, American Federation of Teachers, Ford Foundation, universities, and special education directors. Although a wide variety of groups, agencies, and individuals were included in this category, illustrated in Table L, guidance directors were most often mentioned as providing the impetus for adoption.

Impetus for Adoption of Innovations by General Category of Curriculum, Technology and Organization

Table LI illustrates the source of the impetus for adoption of innovations, later abandoned, by the general categories of curriculum, technology, and organization.

It will be noted that administrators tended to influence the adoption of organizational innovations most, followed by curriculum innovations, with technological innovations accounting for 24.3 per cent of their involvement. Teachers, students, and parents, conversely, influenced the adoption of curriculum innovations most often, with organizational innovations second (31.4 per cent) and technological innovations last (15.2 per cent).

The remaining five categories of individuals, groups, and organizations influencing the adoption of innovations had relatively little impact. Boards of education tended to exert influence upon technological and organizational innovations, while regulatory agencies, publishing and media companies, educational research, and other varied groups, agencies, and individuals tended to have more impact upon the adoption of curricular innovations.

TABLE L

REPORTS BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN WHICH OTHER VARIED INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS PLAYED A ROLE IN THE IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL

Innovation	f	%
PSSC Physics	7	8.2
Harvard Physics	0	0.0
ESCP Physical Science	2	2.4
SSSP Physical Science	0	0.0
IPS Physical Science	5	5.9
Humanities Courses	5	5.9
Career Education	1	1.2
Independent Study Programs	1	1.2
Mini-Courses	7	8.2
Learning Packages	4	4.7
HSGP Geography	1	1.2
IPI	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	2	2.4
Television Instruction	7	8.2
Programmed Instruction	3	3.5
Teaching Machines	1	1.2
Telephone Amplification	3	3.5
Simulation or Gaming	1	1.2
Data Processing Equipment	8	9.4
Computer Assisted Instruction	2	2.4
Flexible Scheduling	4	4.7
Team Teaching	6	7.1
College Credit Courses	6	7.1
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2	2.4
Differentiated Staffing	1	1.2
School-Within-A-School	1	1.2
Cultural Enrichment Program	1	1.2
Optional Class Attendance	0	0.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0
Action Learning	2	2.4
Early Leaving Plan	2	2.4
Total	85	100.2

TABLE LI

IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS LATER ABANDONED AFTER TRIAL BY GENERAL CATEGORY OF CURRICULUM, TECHNOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION

Source of Impetus for Adoption	Curriculum f	Curriculum %	Technology f	Technology %	Organization f	Organization %
Administrators	643	35.8	436	24.3	717	39.9
Teachers, Students Parents	792	53.4	226	15.2	466	31.4
Board of Education	29	24.0	46	38.0	46	38.0
State Department of Education North Central Association Agencies of Federal Government	46	43.8	27	25.7	32	30.5
Publishing and Media Companies	25	64.1	10	25.7	4	10.2
Results of Educational Research	32	48.5	11	16.7	23	34.8
Other	35	41.2	25	29.4	25	29.4
Total	1,602	43.3	781	21.1	1,313	35.5

Individual Sources of Impetus for Adoption

Of all the individual sources of impetus for adoption of innovations later abandoned, teachers were reported more often than any other, accounting for 32.4 per cent of all sources. Building principals ranked second only to teachers, and all administrators as a group accounted for 48.6 per cent of all sources of impetus.

Students and parents had relatively little effect on adoption accounting for only 7.7 per cent of all sources reported. Boards of education, regulatory agencies, publishing companies, and educational research also had little influence on adoption and accounted for only 11.4 per cent of all sources of impetus reported.

These data indicate that adoption of innovations later abandoned, was influenced almost entirely by those in leadership and teaching positions within the school. Very little impact was exerted either by the schools' clients and patrons, or regulatory and supportive agencies. Adoption of the innovations in question was essentially an in-house activity.

TABLE LII

INDIVIDUAL SOURCES OF IMPETUS FOR ADOPTION OF ABANDONED INNOVATIONS

Source of Impetus for Adoption	f	%
Building Principal	1,045	28.3
Other Building Administrators	137	3.7
Superintendent	296	8.0
Director of Curriculum and/or Instruction	318	8.6
Teachers	1,198	32.4
Students	242	6.5
Parents	44	1.2
Board of Education	121	3.3
State Department of Education	43	1.2
Regional Accrediting Association	13	0.4
Federal Government Agencies	49	1.3
Publishing and Media Companies	39	1.1
Results of Educational Research	66	1.8
Other	85	2.3
Total	3,696	100.1

Reasons for Abandonment of Innovations

Tables LIII - LXXXV illustrate the reasons for abandonment of the selected innovations reported by responding schools. The reasons reported are grouped into five categories: reasons related to personnel, reasons related to administrators, reasons related to pupil outcomes, and reasons related to acceptance by patrons.

Reasons for Abandonment of PSSC Physics

PSSC Physics had been adopted by 37.5 per cent of the schools in this study as compared to 43 per cent of the schools in Cawelti's study; a total of 9.3 per cent of the North Central schools had reported abandonment as compared with 3.2 per cent reported by Cawelti.

The overwhelming majority of reasons for abandonment of PSSC Physics were related to administrative and staff personnel and pupil outcomes as shown in Table LIII. These categories accounted for 76.1 per cent of all stated reasons. The individual reasons for abandonment most often given were: lack of acceptance by students, 12 per cent; program detrimental to pupil achievement, 8.3 per cent; change in leadership personnel, 7.8 per cent; costs unjustified by benefits, 6.7 per cent; inadequate training of teachers, 6.4 per cent.

Overall, financing, administration, and patron influence did not figure prominently in abandonment of PSSC Physics with only 23.9 per cent of the reasons for abandonment reported in these categories. Instead, problems of leadership,

TABLE LIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF PSSC PHYSICS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	43	6.7
Federal funds could not be secured	3	0.5
Federal Funds were discontinued	2	0.3
Local funding was discontinued	6	0.9
Other financial reasons	13	2.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	24	3.7
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	50	7.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	3	0.5
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	4	0.6
Teachers did not support the program	65	10.2
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	0.2
Teachers were not adequately trained	41	6.4
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	7	1.1
Other personnel reasons	40	6.3
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	0.8
Objectives were not clearly stated	5	0.8
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activites were not adequate	1	0.2
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	2	0.3
Physical facilities were not suitable	13	2.0
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	14	2.2
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	2	0.3
Other administrative reasons	20	3.1
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	77	12.0
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	53	8.3
Program created scheduling complications	3	0.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	2	0.3
Program adversely affected pupil morale	26	4.1
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	5	0.8
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	11	1.7
Other pupil reasons	74	11.6
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	2	0.3
Program was not accepted by parents	4	0.6
Program was misunderstood by patrons	3	0.5
Program became controversial	4	0.6
Community opposed program expenditures	1	0.2
Other patron acceptance reasons	10	1.6
Total	639	100.0

disenchantment of teachers and students and pupil achievement problems were the leading reasons for abandonment.

Reasons for Abandonment of Harvard Physics

As illustrated in Table V, Harvard Physics had been adopted by only 19.1 per cent of the responding schools and had been abandoned by 1.1 per cent. The data in Table LIV indicate a change in leadership personnel responsible for the innovation was reported as the chief reason for the abandonment of Harvard Physics. Other prominent reasons for abandonment were: costs which exceeded benefits; lack of student acceptance; and inadequate training of teachers.

Reasons related to finance and administration accounted for 26 per cent of all reasons given for abandonment. Personnel and pupil outcome problems accounted for 65.2 per cent.

Reasons for Abandonment of ESCP Physical Science

Earth Science Curriculum Project Physical Science (Table LV) had been adopted by 16.6 per cent of the schools in this study and abandoned by 1.8 per cent. Cawelti reported adoption by 10 per cent of the schools in his study. Again, administrative problems, lack of patron acceptance, and financial reasons played a relatively small part in abandonment amounting to 33.2 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment.

Lack of student acceptance, other varied pupil reasons, changes in leadership personnel, inadequate training of teachers, and costs which exceeded benefits were among the

TABLE LIV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF HARVARD PHYSICS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	9	9.6
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	1	1.1
Other financial reasons	2	2.2
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	5	5.3
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	11	11.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	3	3.2
Teachers did not support the program	3	3.2
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	7	7.5
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	1.1
Other personnel reasons	6	6.4
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	2.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	2	2.2
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	3	3.2
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	2.2
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	1.1
Other administrative reasons	2	2.2
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	8	8.5
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	3.2
Program created scheduling complications	4	4.2
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	1.1
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	2	2.2
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	1	1.1
Other pupil reasons	6	6.4
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	1	1.1
Program was not accepted by parents	2	2.2
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	2.2
Program became controversial	1	1.1
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	2	2.2
Total	93	100.0

TABLE LV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF ESCP PHYSICAL SCIENCE REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	8	6.9
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	0.9
Local funding was discontinued	1	0.9
Other financial reasons	3	2.6
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	4	3.5
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	9	7.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	1.7
Teachers did not support the program	7	6.0
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	8	7.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	6	5.2
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	4	3.5
Objectives were not clearly stated	0	0.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	0.9
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.9
Physical facilities were not suitable	3	2.6
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	3	2.6
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	8	7.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	14	12.2
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	4	3.5
Program created scheduling complications	2	1.7
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	3	2.6
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	2	1.7
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	1	0.9
Other pupil reasons	15	13.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	1	0.9
Program was not accepted by parents	1	0.9
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	1.7
Program became controversial	1	0.9
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	115	100.0

most often stated individual reasons for abandonment. As with PSSC Physics and Harvard Physics, federal funding played little or no part in abandonment.

In the main, individual staff and student personnel problems led to abandonment. There was little in the way of opposition by organized groups such as teacher organizations, boards of education, patron groups, or administrative groups.

Reasons for Abandonment of SSSP Physical Science

Secondary School Science Project programs had been adopted by 144 or 4.4 per cent of the schools in this study, as illustrated in Table LVI. Cawelti reported 3.5 per cent adoption and 0.1 per cent abandonment. North Central schools reported abandonment by 0.7 per cent.

The two leading specified reasons for abandonment of SSSP Physical Science were costs which exceeded benefits and lack of teacher support. Other varied personnel, pupil and administrative reasons amounted to 26.6 per cent of reasons. The majority of reasons (53.1 per cent) for abandonment were related to professional staff or pupils, although these reasons were less a factor in the abandonment of SSSP Physical Science than in other science programs. Financial reasons amounted to 16.8 per cent of all causes of abandonment reported, making financial problems a greater factor in abandonment of SSSP Physical Science than in any of the other science programs in the study.

It will be noted that, as in the case of the other science programs, regulations of the North Central Association

TABLE LVI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF SSSP PHYSICAL SCIENCE

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	7	11.8
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	1	1.7
Other financial reasons	2	3.3
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	2	3.3
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	2	3.3
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	0	0.0
Teachers did not support the program	6	10.0
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	5.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	5	8.3
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	3.3
Objectives were not clearly stated	1	1.7
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	2	3.3
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	1	1.7
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	6	10.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	3	5.0
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	2	3.3
Program adversely affected pupil control	2	3.3
Program adversely affected pupil morale	2	3.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	5	8.3
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	1	1.7
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.7
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	1	1.7
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

or state departments of education played no part in abandonment. Also, as with the other programs, lack of patron acceptance does not seem to have greatly influenced abandonment.

Reasons for Abandonment of IPS Physical Science

The data in Table LVII indicate that of the five categories, the greatest percentage of reasons for abandonment of IPS Physical Science programs was attributed to pupil outcome problems with 32.4 per cent of reasons reported in this category. Lack of pupil acceptance, problems with achievement, interference with ongoing programs, and pupil morale problems were the most often stated reasons in this category.

The second most often stated specific reason for abandonment was that benefits did not justify costs. In addition, widely varied other administrative and pupil reasons amounted to 19.7 per cent of the reasons reported.

Personnel and pupil related reasons for abandonment amounted to 60.4 per cent of all stated reasons. Overall, financial reasons as well as patron acceptance reasons continued to play a relatively small part in abandonment. Administrative problems amounted to 19.7 per cent of reasons reported.

IPS programs ranked second only to PSSC Physics in adoption of science programs and also ranked second in abandonment with 3.2 per cent of schools reporting abandonment after trial.

TABLE LVII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF IPS PHYSICAL SCIENCE REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	21	8.3
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.4
Federal funds were discontinued	2	0.8
Local funding was discontinued	3	1.2
Other financial reasons	8	3.1
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	10	4.0
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	11	4.3
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	0.8
Building administrators did not support the innovation	3	1.2
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	4	1.6
Teachers did not support the program	14	5.5
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	14	5.5
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	5	2.0
Other personnel reasons	9	3.6
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	2.0
Objectives were not clearly stated	8	3.1
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	0.4
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	0.4
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.4
Physical facilities were not suitable	9	3.6
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	6	2.3
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	0.4
Other administrative reasons	18	7.1
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	24	9.5
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	9	3.6
Program created scheduling complications	2	0.8
Program adversely affected pupil control	3	1.2
Program adversely affected pupil morale	5	2.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	6	2.3
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	1	0.4
Other pupil reasons	32	12.6
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	3	1.2
Program was not accepted by parents	2	0.8
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	0.8
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	7	2.8
Total	253	100.0

Reasons for Abandonment of Humanities Courses

Cawelti found approximately 18 per cent of the schools in his study had adopted humanities courses and 0.8 per cent had reported abandonment after trial. In this study, 39.7 per cent of North Central schools reported adoption and 6.5 per cent reported abandonment.

Table LVIII illustrates that, as with the science programs previously mentioned, problems with administrative and staff personnel and student problems accounted for the majority of reasons for abandonment -- in this case, 66.4 per cent. Lack of leadership and training were the most important reasons for abandonment following lack of student acceptance. The lack of necessary leadership or the loss of leadership from the program accounted for 16.8 per cent of stated reasons. Inadequate pre-service training and/or in-service training for teachers accounted for 9.4 per cent. Cost also was a factor, with financial reasons accounting for 10 per cent of reasons. Administrative problems exceeded financial problems with 19.3 per cent of reasons reported in the administrative category. Lack of patron acceptance accounted for only 4.4 per cent of all reasons reported.

Reasons for Abandonment of Career Education

Career education was one of the most durable innovations in the study having been adopted by 1,696 schools and abandoned by only 18. This relatively recent concept of unifying all phases of the curriculum in occupational awareness or preparation, in the few cases reported, was abandoned

TABLE LVIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF HUMANITIES COURSES REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	30	5.2
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.2
Federal funds were discontinued	4	0.7
Local funding was discontinued	6	1.0
Other financial reasons		
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	59	10.2
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	41	7.1
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	5	0.9
Building administrators did not support the innovation	3	0.5
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	29	5.3
Teachers did not support the program	29	5.3
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	35	6.1
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	21	3.6
Other personnel reasons	24	4.2
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	24	4.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	25	4.3
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	0.2
Public relations activities were not adequate	3	0.5
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	5	0.9
Physical facilities were not suitable	20	3.5
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	19	3.3
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	1	0.2
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	1	0.2
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	0.2
Other administrative reasons	14	2.4
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	77	13.4
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	4	0.7
Program created scheduling complications	26	4.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	9	1.6
Program adversely affected pupil morale	7	1.2
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	3	0.5
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	1	0.2
Other pupil reasons	22	3.8
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	4	0.7
Program was not accepted by parents	3	0.5
Program was misunderstood by patrons	8	1.4
Program became controversial	7	1.2
Community opposed program expenditures	1	0.2
Other patron acceptance reasons	3	0.5
Total	576	100.1

TABLE LIX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	5	13.5
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	1	2.7
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	4	10.8
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	0	0.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	1	2.7
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	1	2.7
Teachers did not support the program	1	2.7
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	8.1
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	2.7
Other personnel reasons	2	5.4
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	5.4
Objectives were not clearly stated	2	5.4
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	2.7
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	1	2.7
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	2	5.4
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	3	8.1
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	2.7
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	3	8.1
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	1	2.7
Program was not accepted by parents	0	0.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	2.7
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	2.7
Total	37	99.9

primarily because of: costs which exceeded benefits derived; lack of necessary leadership; inadequate training of teachers; and scheduling complications as shown in Table LIX.

Staff personnel and pupil problems accounted for the majority of reasons for abandonment. Financial and administrative reasons made up the next largest group. Patron acceptance problems played only a minor role in abandonment, accounting for only three of the thirty-seven reasons given.

Reasons for Abandonment of Independent Study Programs

Independent study programs were among the most popular of the practices included in this study with adoptions by 63.5 per cent of the schools. Of the 2,078 schools adopting independent study programs 92 or 2.8 per cent had abandoned the innovation.

Table LX illustrates that the reasons most often given for abandonment were: lack of student acceptance; lack of necessary leadership; problems with pupil control; lack of teacher support; problems with pupil achievement; inadequate teacher training; lack of clearly stated objectives; changes in leadership personnel; inadequate preliminary planning; lack of parent acceptance; controversy over the program; inadequate training of teachers; inadequate materials and equipment; and inadequate physical facilities. Opposition to the program from organized groups played little or no part in abandonment. Responding schools reported no opposition from teacher organizations, community groups or the North Central

TABLE LX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF INDEPENDENT STUDY PROGRAMS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	10	2.6
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.3
Federal funds were discontinued	1	0.3
Local funding was discontinued	3	0.8
Other financial reasons	2	0.5
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	29	7.6
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	17	4.5
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	5	1.3
Building administrators did not support the innovation	6	1.6
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	7	1.8
Teachers did not support the program	25	6.6
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	20	5.2
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	13	3.4
Other personnel reasons	5	1.3
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	18	4.7
Objectives were not clearly stated	20	5.2
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	5	1.3
Public relations activities were not adequate	4	1.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	4	0.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	12	3.1
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	13	3.4
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	1	0.3
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	3	0.8
Other administrative reasons	3	0.8
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	32	8.4
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	23	6.0
Program created scheduling complications	4	1.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	27	7.1
Program adversely affected pupil morale	8	2.1
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	10	2.6
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	4	1.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	6	1.6
Program was not accepted by parents	15	3.9
Program was misunderstood by patrons	11	2.9
Program became controversial	14	3.7
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	2	0.5
Total	383	100.0

Association. Only one school reported abandonment because of violation of state department of education policies.

Financial and patron acceptance reasons accounted for only 13.1 per cent of reported reasons for abandonment. Again, staff and student personnel reasons were most often reported although administrative reasons amounted to 21.4 per cent of reasons. Inadequate planning and objectives which were not clearly formulated were the most often stated administrative reasons.

Reasons for Abandonment of Mini-Courses

Mini-courses were found in 1,679 or 51.3 per cent of the responding schools and were abandoned by 99 or 3 per cent. The most frequently reported reasons for abandonment reported were: lack of teacher support; scheduling complications; lack of student acceptance; expenditures not justified by benefits; lack of necessary leadership; cumbersome administrative detail; lack of adequate planning; lack of materials and equipment; problems with pupil control; lack of clearly stated objectives; inadequate pre-service and in-service training of teachers.

As Table LXI illustrates, staff personnel reasons made up the largest category of reasons for abandonment, amounting to 32.3 per cent of all reasons reported. Lack of teacher support was the largest single reason reported. Administrative problems accounted for the second largest category of abandonment of mini-courses -- the only curricular innovation in which such problems figured as prominently in

TABLE LXI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF MINI-COURSES

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	22	6.0
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	5	1.4
Other financial reasons	5	1.4
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	21	5.8
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	11	3.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	4	1.1
Building administrators did not support the innovation	2	0.5
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	11	3.0
Teachers did not support the program	35	9.6
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	2	0.5
Teachers were not adequately trained	12	3.3
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	13	3.6
Other personnel reasons	9	2.5
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	18	4.9
Objectives were not clearly stated	14	3.8
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	21	5.8
Public relations activities were not adequate	5	1.4
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	4	1.1
Physical facilities were not suitable	10	2.7
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	9	2.5
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	1	0.3
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	4	1.1
Other administrative reasons	6	1.6
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new programs	24	6.6
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	0.8
Program created scheduling complications	28	7.7
Program adversely affected pupil control	16	4.4
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	0.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	6	1.6
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	3	0.8
Other pupil reasons	15	4.1
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	3	0.8
Program was not accepted by parents	2	0.5
Program was misunderstood by patrons	8	2.2
Program became controversial	3	0.8
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	8	2.2
Total	364	99.7

abandonment. Financial problems and lack of patron acceptance accounted for only 15 per cent of reasons for abandonment and reasons related to pupil outcomes accounted for 25.8 per cent.

Reasons for Abandonment of Learning Packages

Learning packages, adopted by 1,440 or 44 per cent of responding schools were abandoned by 67 or 2.1 per cent of the schools. Staff and pupil personnel problems accounted for 62.2 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment shown in Table LXII.

The most often reported reasons for abandonment of learning packages were: lack of student acceptance; expenditures not justified by benefits; lack of teacher support; pupil achievement problems; changes in leadership personnel; inadequate teacher pre-service and in-service training; lack of necessary leadership; inadequate planning.

Financial and patron acceptance reasons accounted for 20.3 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment. No opposition from organizations such as teacher groups, state departments of education, and the North Central Association was reported.

As with most of the other curricular innovations, people-related reasons played the largest role in abandonment.

Reasons for Abandonment of HSGP Geography

As indicated in Table LXIII, High School Geography Project Materials had been adopted by only 250 of the responding

TABLE LXII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF LEARNING PACKAGES

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	20	7.4
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.4
Federal funds were discontinued	3	1.1
Local funding was discontinued	1	0.4
Other financial reasons	2	0.7
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	11	4.1
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	18	6.6
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	0.7
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	0.4
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	8	3.0
Teachers did not support the change	20	7.4
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	17	6.3
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	12	4.4
Other personnel reasons	10	3.7
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	11	4.1
Objectives were not clearly stated	8	3.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	4	1.5
Public relations activities were not adequate	2	0.7
Administrator/Staff personnel relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.4
Physical facilities were not suitable	2	0.7
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	9	3.3
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated the regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	3	1.1
Other administrative reasons	5	1.8
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	25	9.2
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	19	7.0
Program created scheduling complications	4	1.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	6	2.2
Program adversely affected pupil morale	6	2.2
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	0.4
Program complicated high school/college transition of pupils	3	1.1
Other pupil reasons	8	3.0
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	1	0.4
Program was not accepted by parents	9	3.3
Program was misunderstood by patrons	5	1.8
Program became controversial	9	3.3
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	4	1.5
Total	271	100.1

schools, amounting to 7.6 per cent of the total number of schools. Fourteen or 0.4 per cent of the schools reported abandonment.

Administrative and patron acceptance reasons accounted for only 14.8 per cent of all reasons for abandonment reported. Finance problems figured rather prominently in abandonment accounting for 22.2 per cent of all stated reasons. However, staff and pupil outcome reasons accounted for 62.9 per cent of all reasons reported.

Of all individual reasons reported, lack of student acceptance and changes in leadership personnel were most often reported. It will be noted that of all possible administrative reasons, lack of clearly stated objectives, and inadequate planning were the only reasons indicated by responding schools. Lack of student acceptance was the only reason related to student outcomes reported.

Reasons for Abandonment of Individual Prescription of Instruction

Making diagnoses and individual prescription of instruction is available as a formalized program for entire elementary schools along with individual subject area programs developed for secondary schools. Aside from the formal program, Individually Prescribed Instruction, the principle can be used in programs developed by the local school. In this study, 477 or 14.6 per cent of responding schools reported adoption of either the formal secondary programs or local versions of the program. Eight schools or 0.2 per cent

TABLE LXIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF HSGP GEOGRAPHY

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	1	3.7
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	3.7
Local funding was discontinued	2	7.4
Other financial reasons	2	7.4
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	1	3.7
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	3	11.1
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	3.7
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	1	3.7
Teachers did not support the program	1	3.7
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	2	7.4
In-service training was not provided or was not adequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	1	3.7
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	1	3.7
Objectives were not clearly stated	1	3.7
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	0	0.0
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	4	14.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	3	11.1
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	1	3.7
Program was not accepted by parents	0	0.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	3.7
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	27	99.9

reported abandonment.

As illustrated in Table LXIV staff personnel and administrative reasons made up the largest categories of reasons for abandonment. Lack of support by teachers, inadequate teacher training, and problems with pupil control were the leading individual reasons for abandonment. Problems with finance accounted for only 5.7 per cent of the stated reasons and problems with patron acceptance accounted for 13.3 per cent.

Neither policies of state departments of education or the North Central Association figured in the abandonment of the innovation. Only one school reported abandonment because of opposition by teacher organizations.

Reasons for Abandonment of SRSS Sociology

Table LXV describes the reasons for abandonment of SRSS Sociology reported by the responding schools in the study. Adoption of this innovation totaled 278 schools or 8.5 per cent of all schools in the study. Seven of the schools or 0.2 per cent reported abandonment after trial.

Of the ten individual reasons indicated by the seven schools reporting abandonment, financial considerations and administrative problems were reported only once each and patron acceptance problems did not contribute to abandonment. Staff and student personnel problems accounted for the greatest number of reasons for abandonment with four, or 40 per cent each of the reasons reported.

TABLE LXIV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF INDIVIDUAL PRESCRIPTION OF INSTRUCTION

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	3	5.7
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	3	5.7
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	3	5.7
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	1	1.9
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	1	1.9
Teachers did not support the program	4	7.5
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	1.9
Teachers were not adequately trained	4	7.5
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	3	5.7
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	3.8
Objectives were not clearly stated	3	5.7
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	1.9
Administrator/Staff relations were not satisfactory	1	1.9
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	1.9
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	3.8
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	2	3.8
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	1	1.9
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	5.7
Program created scheduling complications	1	1.9
Program adversely affected pupil control	4	7.5
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	1.9
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition of pupils	1	1.9
Other pupil reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	2	3.8
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.9
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	3.8
Program became controversial	1	1.9
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	1.9
Total	53	100.1

TABLE LXV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF SRSS SOCIOLOGY

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	0	0.0
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	10.0
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	1	10.0
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	1	10.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists or support personnel were not available	1	10.0
Teachers did not support the program	1	10.0
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	0	0.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	0	0.0
Objectives were not clearly stated	0	0.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/ Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	0	0.0
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	1	10.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Projects practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	2	20.0
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	1	10.0
Program created scheduling complications	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition of pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	1	10.0
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	0	0.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	10	100.0

Reasons for Abandonment of Ethnic Studies

As is illustrated in Table LXVI ethnic studies, which had been adopted by 1,359 schools and abandoned by 60, were abandoned primarily because of staff and student personnel problems. Combined, these categories accounted for 71.3 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment.

Lack of acceptance by students was the most commonly stated individual reason accounting for 20.5 per cent of all reasons, which is interesting in the light of student demands for such courses in the past.

Reasons related to pupil outcomes accounted for 40.2 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment. Staff personnel problems amounted to 31.1 per cent of all reasons with lack of necessary leadership the most often reported individual staff personnel reason. Changes in leadership personnel and inadequate training of teachers were next in order.

Lack of patron acceptance accounted for 6.8 per cent of the stated reasons for the abandonment of ethnic studies; administrative problems, 15.9 per cent; and financial problems, 6.1 per cent.

It will be apparent that, as with most of the other curricular innovations, personnel factors in the school played a much larger part in abandonment than did financial matters, administrative difficulties, or problems with school patrons.

TABLE LXVI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF ETHNIC STUDIES

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	7	5.3
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.8
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	14	10.6
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	8	6.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	0.8
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	4	3.0
Teachers did not support the program	3	2.3
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	8	6.1
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	2	1.5
Other personnel reasons	1	0.8
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	3.7
Objectives were not clearly stated	4	3.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	0.8
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	2	1.5
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	1.5
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	1	0.8
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	6	4.5
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	27	20.5
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	1	0.8
Program created scheduling complications	2	1.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	0.8
Program adversely affected pupil morale	3	2.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	4	3.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	15	11.3
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	4	3.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	1.5
Program became controversial	3	2.3
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	132	100.0

Reasons for Abandonment of Television Instruction

Television instruction was reported adopted by 764 or 23.4 per cent of the responding schools and abandoned by 121 or 3.7 per cent. Cawelti reported adoption by 16.5 per cent of the schools in his study and abandonment by 3.8 per cent.

Financial problems, as reported in Table LXVII, played a relatively greater role in abandonment of television instruction than with innovations mentioned previously, with the exception of HSGP Geography. Benefits of the program which could not justify costs was the most commonly reported individual reason.

Other major reasons for abandonment were lack of teacher support, scheduling complications, lack of student acceptance, lack of suitable physical facilities, discontinuance of federal funds, inadequate training of teachers, and discontinuance of local fundings.

Again, the majority of all stated reasons for abandonment were included in the categories of staff and pupil personnel problems. Administrative problems accounted for 19.7 per cent of reasons reported and patron acceptance reasons 4.4 per cent. Opposition from organizations including state departments of education, the North Central Association, or teacher organizations played little or no part in abandonment.

Reasons for Abandonment of Programmed Instruction

Programmed instruction was adopted by 1,155 or 35.3 per

TABLE LXVII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF TELEVISION INSTRUCTION

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	41	10.1
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	19	4.7
Local funding was discontinued	16	4.0
Other financial reasons	14	3.4
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	13	3.2
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	9	2.2
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	6	1.5
Building administrators did not support the innovation	10	2.5
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	12	2.9
Teachers did not support the program	34	8.4
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	0.2
Teachers were not adequately trained	18	4.4
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	10	2.5
Other personnel reasons	7	1.7
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	9	2.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	10	2.5
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	8	2.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	4	1.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	22	5.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	9	2.2
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	1	0.2
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	0.2
Other administrative reasons	16	4.9
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	24	5.9
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	14	3.4
Program created scheduling complications	29	7.1
Program adversely affected pupil control	9	2.2
Program adversely affected pupil morale	7	1.7
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	2	0.5
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	11	2.7
Other pupil reasons	3	0.7
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	6	1.5
Program was not accepted by parents	3	0.7
Program was misunderstood by patrons	5	1.2
Program became controversial	2	0.5
Community opposed program expenditures	2	0.5
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	407	100.0

cent of responding schools in this study while being abandoned by 138 or 4.2 per cent. Cawelti reported adoption by 29 per cent of the schools in his study, and abandonment by 4.9 per cent.

Table LXVIII illustrates that problems of pupil outcomes accounted for 34.1 per cent of reasons for abandonment. Lack of pupil acceptance was the leading individual reason for abandonment. Other reasons often reported were: costs which were not justified by benefits; lack of teacher support; unsatisfactory pupil achievement; pupil morale problems; inadequate planning; changes in leadership personnel or inadequate leadership; inadequate materials and equipment; unsuitable physical facilities; lack of adequate pre-service and in-service training for teachers.

Human factors within the school accounted for 63.7 per cent of all reasons reported. Administrative problems and financial considerations accounted for 30.3 per cent and patron acceptance reasons 6 per cent. Organizations played little or no role in abandonment. It is interesting to note that student morale problems were a factor in the abandonment of this rather mechanical though rational, sequential innovation.

Reasons for Abandonment of Teaching Machines

Teaching machines provide basically the same advantages as programmed instruction except that they provide more control of content as it is exposed to the student. They

TABLE LXVIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	37	8.3
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	6	1.3
Local funding was discontinued	8	1.8
Other financial reasons	5	1.1
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	14	3.1
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	19	4.3
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	0.4
Building administrators did not support the innovation	5	1.1
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	11	2.5
Teachers did not support the program	46	10.3
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	0.2
Teachers were not adequately trained	15	3.4
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	13	2.9
Other personnel reasons	6	1.3
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	19	4.3
Objectives were not clearly stated	12	2.7
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	5	1.1
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	0.2
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	3	0.7
Physical facilities were not suitable	14	3.1
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	16	3.6
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	1	0.2
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	4	0.9
Other administrative reasons	4	0.9
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	51	11.4
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	35	7.8
Program created scheduling complications	6	1.3
Program adversely affected pupil control	6	1.3
Program adversely affected pupil morale	24	5.4
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	3	0.7
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	2	0.4
Other pupil reasons	26	5.8
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	2	0.4
Program was not accepted by parents	8	1.8
Program was misunderstood by patrons	8	1.8
Program became controversial	4	0.9
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	5	1.1
Total	447	100.0

may be used by students without the necessity of direct supervision. Cawelti found approximately 13 per cent of the schools in his study had adopted teaching machines and 1.7 per cent had abandoned them after trial. In this study 694 or 21.2 per cent of North Central schools had adopted the innovation and 59 or 1.8 per cent had abandoned them.

Table LXIX illustrates that problems with staff and administrative personnel accounted for 32.5 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment. Lack of teacher support, inadequate teacher pre-service and in-service training were the reasons in this category most often reported. Financial problems made up 23.1 per cent of reported reasons for abandonment with costs exceeding derived benefits being the single most important factor in abandonment reported, 15.9 per cent of all reasons. Lack of acceptance by students ranked second in individual reasons for abandonment.

Administrative problems accounted for 18.9 per cent of all reasons reported and patron acceptance reasons played a relatively minor role and accounted for 6.1 per cent of reasons.

Reasons for Abandonment of Telephone Amplification

The use of telephone amplification to provide two-way communication between classes and resource persons was found in only 5 per cent of the reporting schools in Cawelti's study and had been abandoned by 0.3 per cent. Some of the small school projects were early pioneers in this innovation. A total of 326 or 10 per cent of North Central schools

TABLE LXIX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF TEACHING MACHINES

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	31	15.9
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.5
Federal funds were discontinued	7	3.6
Local funding was discontinued	4	2.1
Other financial reasons	2	1.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	6	3.1
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	7	3.6
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	1	0.5
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	0.5
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	7	3.6
Teachers did not support the program	15	7.8
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	12	6.2
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	10	5.1
Other personnel reasons	4	2.1
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	2.6
Objectives were not clearly stated	9	4.6
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	0.5
Public relations activities were not adequate	3	1.5
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	2	1.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	9	4.6
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	7	3.6
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	1	0.5
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	18	9.2
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	1.5
Program created scheduling complications	1	0.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	3	1.5
Program adversely affected pupil morale	4	2.1
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	2	1.0
Other pupil reasons	7	3.6
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptanc		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	3	1.5
Program was misunderstood by patrons	3	1.5
Program became controversial	4	2.1
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	2	1.0
Total	195	100.0

reported adoption and 33 or 1 per cent reported abandonment after trial.

As with teaching machines, telephone amplification, shown in Table LXX, was most often abandoned because costs exceeded benefits derived. Finance and staff and administrative personnel problems accounted for 55.6 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment. Lack of teacher support and changes in leadership personnel were the most often reported personnel reasons. Lack of pupil acceptance accounted for 6.5 per cent of all reasons for abandonment reported. Lack of adequate planning and suitable facilities totaled 10.2 per cent of reported reasons. Patron acceptance reasons accounted for only 3.9 per cent of all reasons.

Reasons for Abandonment of Simulation or Gaming

Simulation or gaming had been adopted by 14.8 per cent of the schools in Cawelti's study and had been abandoned by 0.1 per cent. In this study, 2,100 or 64.2 per cent of the schools reported adoption while only 18 or 0.6 per cent had abandoned it, making it the most durable of all innovations in the study.

Table LXXI illustrates that the eighteen schools reporting abandonment indicated 48.4 per cent of the reasons for abandonment were related to administrative and staff problems. The largest single cause for abandonment reported was a change in leadership, which made it difficult or impossible to continue the program.

TABLE LXX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF TELEPHONE AMPLIFICATION

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	15	19.6
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	1.3
Local funding was discontinued	2	2.6
Other financial reasons	3	3.9
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	2	2.6
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	6	7.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	2.6
Teachers did not support the program	6	7.8
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	2	2.6
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	3	3.9
Other personnel reasons	1	1.3
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	4	5.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	3	3.9
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	3	3.9
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	4	5.2
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	1.3
Other administrative reasons	1	1.3
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	5	6.5
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	2	2.6
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	1.3
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	1.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	6	7.8
Reasons Related to Patron Acceptance		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.3
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	2	2.6
Total	77	99.9

Financial problems played a relatively minor role in abandonment, accounting for 8.7 per cent of all reported reasons. Patron acceptance problems were of little consequence and amounted to only 2.9 per cent. Administrative arrangements required to implement and operate the program did not play a particularly important role in abandonment amounting to only 17.2 per cent of reasons reported. Pupil outcome problems influencing abandonment totaled 22.9 per cent.

It will be noted from the foregoing that simulation and gaming in general was acceptable to patrons, teachers, and students, relatively easy to administer, and created no particular finance problems.

Reasons for Abandonment of Data Processing Equipment

The use of data processing equipment in North Central schools responding to this study was found in 1,772 or 54.2 per cent of the schools. This was approximately double the percentage of schools reporting adoption in the Cawelti study. Of the schools reporting adoption, 112 or 3.4 per cent had abandoned data processing after trial as compared to 0.8 reported by Cawelti.

As illustrated in Table LXXII, cost was the primary factor in abandonment, accounting for 27.5 per cent of all reasons stated. The single reason most often reported was that benefits did not justify costs -- amounting to one-fourth of the reasons reported. Scheduling problems interestingly enough was the second most often reported reason.

TABLE LXXI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF SIMULATION OR GAMING

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	1	2.9
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	1	2.9
Other financial reasons	1	2.9
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	3	8.5
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	8	22.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	0	0.0
Teachers did not support the program	4	11.3
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	0	0.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	2.9
Other personnel reasons	1	2.9
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	1	2.9
Objectives were not clearly stated	1	2.9
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	2.9
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	5.6
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accreding agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	1	2.9
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	3	8.6
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	1	2.9
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	2.9
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	2.9
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	0	0.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	2.9
Total	33	100.1

TABLE LXXII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	81	24.5
Federal funds could not be secured	4	1.2
Federal funds were discontinued	2	0.6
Local funding was discontinued	2	0.6
Other financial reasons	2	0.6
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	5	1.5
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	4	1.2
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	8	2.4
Building administrators did not support the innovation	11	3.4
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	20	6.0
Teachers did not support the program	5	1.5
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	4	1.2
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	0.3
Other personnel reasons	10	3.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	1.5
Objectives were not clearly stated	0	0.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	36	10.8
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.3
Physical facilities were not suitable	8	2.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	5	1.5
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	8	2.4
Other administrative reasons	15	4.5
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	2	0.6
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	0.9
Program created scheduling complications	39	11.8
Program adversely affected pupil control	7	2.1
Program adversely affected pupil morale	10	3.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	7	2.1
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	6	1.8
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	3	0.9
Program was not accepted by parents	5	1.5
Program was misunderstood by patrons	4	1.2
Program became controversial	5	1.5
Community opposed program expenditures	1	0.3
Other patron acceptance reasons	3	0.9
Total	332	100.0

Cumbersome administrative detail ranked third and amounted to 10.8 per cent of all reported reasons.

Staff personnel and administrative problems accounted for 20.5 per cent of reported reasons with lack of competent personnel being the most often stated individual reason and amounting to 6 per cent. Patron acceptance problems were a relatively small factor in abandonment accounting for 6.3 per cent of the total reasons reported.

Reasons for Abandonment of Computer Assisted Instruction

Computer assisted instruction was found to have been adopted by 979 of the North Central schools in this study amounting to 29.9 per cent of the 3,271 schools. Abandonment after trial was reported by 46 or 1.4 per cent.

As with the use of data processing, Table LXXIII illustrates that computer assisted instruction was most often abandoned because of financial problems. Costs which exceeded benefits derived and discontinuance of local funding accounted for 31.4 per cent of all reasons for abandonment reported. All reasons related to finance amounted to 39.5 per cent. Other major reasons reported were: inadequate physical facilities and lack of acceptance by students.

Unlike many of the other innovations, lack of support by teachers was not an important factor in abandonment, amounting to only 3 per cent of reported reasons. All personnel reasons combined accounted for 20.1 per cent of stated causes of abandonment. Problems of administration of the

TABLE LXXIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	21	21.3
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	2	2.0
Local funding was discontinued	10	10.1
Other financial reasons	6	6.1
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	5	5.1
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	4	4.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	1	1.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	3	3.0
Teachers did not support the program	1	1.0
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	3.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	3	3.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	2.0
Objectives were not clearly stated	0	0.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	1.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	9	9.1
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	2.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	3	3.0
Other administrative reasons	1	1.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	8	8.2
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	1.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	1.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	4	4.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	3	3.0
Program was not accepted by parents	2	2.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	1.0
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	1	1.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	1.0
Total	99	99.9

program totaled 18.1 per cent while pupil outcome reasons amounted to 14.2 per cent of reported reasons. Patron acceptance problems accounted for only 8 per cent of all causes for abandonment with lack of support by the board of education being the single most important patron acceptance reason.

Reasons for Abandonment of Flexible Scheduling

Adoption of flexible scheduling was reported by 600 or 18.3 per cent of responding schools in this study as compared with 14.8 per cent in the Cawelti study. Although Cawelti found that only 0.8 per cent of the schools in his study had abandoned flexible scheduling, 146 or 4.5 per cent of the 3,271 schools in this study reported abandonment.

The most frequently reported causes for abandonment were related to pupil outcomes, as are illustrated in Table LXXIV. Problems with pupil control was the leading cause for abandonment. In all, 29.8 per cent of all reported reasons were related to pupil outcomes.

Personnel reasons were also an important factor in abandonment amounting to 26.5 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment. Lack of teacher support and inadequate pre-service and in-service training of teachers were the leading individual personnel reasons stated.

Although flexible scheduling attempts to provide a better basis for organizing learning experiences according to varying needs, apparently it is difficult to match available facilities to the requirements of flexible scheduling for

TABLE LXXIV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	39	4.2
Federal funds could not be secured	1	0.1
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	5	0.5
Other financial reasons	9	1.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	20	2.2
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	24	2.6
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	17	1.8
Building administrators did not support the innovation	17	1.8
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	16	1.7
Teachers did not support the program	63	6.8
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	2	0.2
Teachers were not adequately trained	40	4.3
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	36	3.9
Other personnel reasons	11	1.2
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	32	3.4
Objectives were not clearly stated	24	2.6
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	25	2.7
Public relations activities were not adequate	23	2.5
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	10	1.1
Physical facilities were not suitable	69	7.5
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	19	2.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	5	0.5
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	2	0.2
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	16	1.7
Other administrative reasons	11	1.2
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	17	1.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	45	4.8
Program created scheduling complications	62	6.7
Program adversely affected pupil control	88	9.5
Program adversely affected pupil morale	29	3.1
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	24	2.6
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	3	0.3
Other pupil reasons	9	1.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	15	1.6
Program was not accepted by parents	32	3.4
Program was misunderstood by patrons	30	3.2
Program became controversial	34	3.7
Community opposed program expenditures	3	0.3
Other patron acceptance reasons	3	0.3
Total	930	100.0

large and small group instruction, learning labs, individual study, etc. The leading cause of administrative problems reported was lack of suitable physical facilities which accounted for 7.5 per cent of all reasons reported. In all, problems of administering the program amounted to 25.4 per cent of all reported reasons.

Problems related to finance played only a minor role in abandonment amounting to 5.8 per cent of all causes reported. Patron acceptance problems accounted for 12.5 per cent of all reported reasons. Controversy over the program, lack of acceptance by parents, and misunderstanding by patrons were the leading individual patron acceptance reasons reported.

Reasons for Abandonment of Team Teaching

Team teaching, which attempts to take advantage of specialized competencies of teachers, was reported adopted by 41 per cent of all responding schools in Cawelti's study and had been abandoned by 4.3 per cent. In this study, as illustrated in Table LXXV, 2,112 or 64.6 per cent of schools had adopted the practice while 389 or 11.9 per cent reported abandonment. This represents both the highest degree of adoption and the highest degree of abandonment of the innovations in this study.

The majority of reasons for abandonment were confined to the personnel category. Lack of teacher support was the leading cause, amounting to 11.7 per cent of all reasons reported. Lack of leadership or changes in leadership and

TABLE LXXV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF TEAM TEACHING

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	60	4.4
Federal funds could not be secured	4	0.3
Federal funds were discontinued	2	0.1
Local funding was discontinued	8	0.6
Other financial reasons	17	1.2
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	123	8.9
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	91	6.6
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	9	0.7
Building administrators did not support the innovation	8	0.6
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	37	2.7
Teachers did not support the program	162	11.7
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	3	0.2
Teachers were not adequately trained	120	8.7
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	79	5.7
Other personnel reasons	62	4.5
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	71	5.1
Objectives were not clearly stated	55	4.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	10	0.7
Public relations activities were not adequate	14	1.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	11	0.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	98	7.1
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	21	1.5
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	1	0.1
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	1	0.1
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	6	0.4
Other administrative reasons	29	2.1
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	48	3.5
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	32	2.3
Program created scheduling complications	54	3.9
Program adversely affected pupil control	31	2.2
Program adversely affected pupil morale	25	1.8
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	6	0.4
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	5	0.4
Other pupil reasons	16	1.2
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	5	0.4
Program was not accepted by parents	12	0.9
Program was misunderstood by patrons	20	1.4
Program became controversial	19	1.4
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	7	0.5
Total	1,382	100.0

inadequate pre-service or in-service training figured prominently in abandonment totaling 29.9 per cent of reported reasons.

Problems of administering the program accounted for 22.9 per cent of reported causes of abandonment. Unsuitable physical facilities made up 7.1 per cent while 9.1 per cent of causes for abandonment were related to lack of adequate planning or poorly stated objectives.

Scheduling complications and lack of pupil acceptance were the leading reasons related to pupil outcomes. Problems of pupil achievement, control, and morale amounted to 6.3 per cent of all reasons stated.

Financial problems and patron acceptance difficulties did not figure prominently in abandonment, amounting to only 11.2 per cent of reported reasons.

Reasons for Abandonment of College Credit Courses

College credit courses provided for able high school students enabling them to participate in college level courses for credit as an enriching experience were reported in use by 28 per cent of the schools in Cawelti's study. Abandonment was reported by 1.4 per cent. In this study of North Central schools, 1,388 or 42.4 per cent of responding schools reported adoption of the practice while 60 or 1.8 per cent reported abandonment.

As shown in Table LXXVI, pupil outcome reasons was the largest single category of reasons reported, with lack of pupil acceptance being the most commonly reported individual

TABLE LXXVI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF COLLEGE CREDIT COURSES

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	8	6.7
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	0.8
Local funding was discontinued	5	4.2
Other financial reasons	6	5.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	6	5.0
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	1	0.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	1.7
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	0.8
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	1.7
Teachers did not support the program	10	8.3
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	2.5
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	2	1.7
Other personnel reasons	3	2.5
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	3	2.5
Objectives were not clearly stated	4	3.5
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	3	2.5
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	0.8
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	0.8
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	5	4.2
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	18	15.0
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	2	1.7
Program created scheduling complications	4	3.3
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	3	2.5
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	5	4.2
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	3	2.5
Other pupil reasons	11	9.2
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	2	1.7
Program was not accepted by parents	1	0.8
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	1	0.8
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	2	1.7
Total	120	100.0

reason. Personnel problems amounted to 25 per cent of stated reasons for abandonment, with lack of teacher support accounting for 8.3 per cent. Administration of the practice proved to be a relatively minor factor in abandonment with only 14.9 per cent of reasons in this category.

Financial problems accounted for 16.7 per cent of reasons for abandonment while patron acceptance problems made up only 5 per cent of all causes for abandonment reported.

Reasons for Abandonment of Non-Graded Programs

Non-graded programs had been adopted by 621 or 19 per cent of North Central schools with 15 or 0.5 per cent of the 3,271 schools reporting abandonment. This compares with Cawelti's findings of 4.7 per cent adoption and .01 abandonment.

This program, which allows students to pursue any course in which they are interested and have the ability to achieve, without regard to grade level, sequence, or progress of other students, was most often abandoned because of problems with pupil outcomes. Administration of the program ranked second in causes of abandonment, accounting for 24.8 per cent of all reported reasons. Personnel reasons made up 22.9 per cent of causes for abandonment with lack of teacher support accounting for 7.7 per cent. Patron acceptance problems totaled 19.2 per cent of reasons for abandonment of non-graded programs -- higher than that reported for any previously mentioned innovation. Problems of finance amounted to only 5.7 per cent of reasons reported.

TABLE LXXVII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF NON-GRADED PROGRAMS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	2	3.8
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	1.9
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	1	1.9
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	2	3.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	1.9
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	0	0.0
Teachers did not support the program	4	7.8
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	1.9
Teachers were not adequately trained	2	3.8
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	1.9
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	3.8
Objectives were not clearly stated	2	3.8
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	2	3.8
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	1.9
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	2	3.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	4	7.8
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	4	7.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	2	3.8
Program created scheduling complications	1	1.9
Program adversely affected pupil control	3	5.8
Program adversely affected pupil morale	2	3.8
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	1	1.9
Other pupil reasons	1	1.9
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	1	1.9
Program was not accepted by parents	4	7.8
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	1.9
Program became controversial	4	7.8
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	52	99.9

Personnel, administration, and pupil outcome problems totaled 74.5 per cent of all causes of abandonment and these causes were rather equally divided at 22.9 per cent, 24.8 per cent, and 26.8 per cent, respectively.

Reasons for Abandonment of Teacher Aides or Paraprofessionals

The use of teacher aides or paraprofessionals is generally based upon the contention that their utilization can result in improved instruction because teachers are given more time for planning and preparation. Cawelti reported employment of aides and paraprofessionals in 29.1 per cent of schools in his study. Abandonment was reported by 1.3 per cent. Adoption in North Central schools totaled 2,019 or 61.7 per cent of responding schools with 106 or 3.2 per cent reporting abandonment as is illustrated in Table LXXVIII.

The expenditures attendant to this innovation accounted for 39 per cent of the causes for abandonment. The withdrawal of local funding was the most often reported individual cause for abandonment, followed by the withdrawal of federal funding and costs which exceeded benefits. Personnel problems amounted to 26.4 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment. Interestingly enough, the leading individual personnel reason for abandonment was opposition from teachers -- those the innovation was designed to help.

Pupil achievement, morale and control problems amounted to 14 per cent of all stated causes of abandonment. A total

TABLE LXXVIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF THE USE OF TEACHER AIDES OR PARA-PROFESSIONALS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	16	7.3
Federal funds could not be secured	11	5.0
Federal funds were discontinued	24	10.9
Local funding was discontinued	30	13.6
Other financial reasons	5	2.2
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	7	3.1
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	3	1.3
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	7	3.1
Building administrators did not support the innovation	5	2.2
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	5	2.2
Teachers did not support the program	12	5.5
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	6	2.7
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	6	2.7
Other personnel reasons	8	3.6
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	2.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	5	2.2
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	0.4
Public relations activities were not adequate	3	1.3
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	0.4
Physical facilities were not suitable	4	1.8
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	1	0.4
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	0.4
Other administrative reasons	6	2.7
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	4	1.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	8	3.6
Program created scheduling complications	1	0.4
Program adversely affected pupil control	17	7.7
Program adversely affected pupil morale	6	2.7
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	0.4
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	5	2.2
Program was not accepted by parents	5	2.2
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	0.4
Program became controversial	1	0.4
Community opposed program expenditures	2	0.9
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	223	99.9

of 16.6 per cent of all reasons reported were related to pupil outcomes. Administrative problems accounted for 11.8 per cent of reported reasons and patron acceptance problems 6.1 per cent.

Reasons for Abandonment of Differentiated Staffing

Differentiated staffing, which makes extensive use of teacher aides and paraprofessionals, had been adopted by 399 or 12.2 per cent of responding schools and abandoned by 9 or 0.3 per cent.

As shown in Table LXXIX, only reasons related to personnel figured prominently in abandonment, accounting for 55.4 per cent of reported reasons. Lack of teacher support was the leading individual reason. Pupil outcome reasons totaled 16.8 per cent of reported causes. Administrative and financial reasons amounted to 25.2 per cent of stated reasons and patron acceptance reasons had almost no influence on abandonment with only 2.8 per cent of reasons reported included in this category.

Reasons for Abandonment of School-Within-A-School Plans

The practice of dividing a large secondary school into smaller schools each with its own administration, building space and students is aimed at combating the negative aspects of "bigness". Only 2.7 per cent of the schools in Cawelti's study had adopted the practice while 0.3 per cent had abandoned it. North Central schools in this study reported slightly higher adoption by 177 or 5.4 per cent and

TABLE LXXIX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	2	5.6
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local fundings was discontinued	2	5.6
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	2	5.6
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	1	2.8
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	1	2.8
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	2.8
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	1	2.8
Teachers did not support the program	6	16.6
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	2	5.6
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	8.2
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	3	8.2
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	2	5.6
Objectives were not clearly stated	2	5.6
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	1	2.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	0	0.0
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	1	2.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	1	2.8
Program created scheduling complications	2	5.6
Program adversely affected pupil control	1	2.8
Program adversely affected pupil morale	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	2.8
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	1	2.8
Program was not accepted by parents	0	0.0
Program was misunderstood by patrons	0	0.0
Program became controversial	0	0.0
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	36	100.2

TABLE LXXX

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF SCHOOL-WITHIN-A-SCHOOL PLANS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	5	5.3
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	1	1.1
Local funding was discontinued	1	1.1
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	6	6.4
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	6	6.4
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	1.1
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	2.1
Teachers did not support the program	7	7.4
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	5	5.3
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	3	3.2
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	5	5.3
Objectives were not clearly stated	6	6.4
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	2	2.1
Public relations activities were not adequate	2	2.1
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	3	3.2
Physical facilities were not suitable	7	7.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	2	2.1
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	3	3.2
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	1	1.1
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	3	3.2
Program created scheduling complications	7	7.4
Program adversely affected pupil control	2	2.1
Program adversely affected pupil morale	4	4.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	1.1
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	3	3.2
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.1
Program was misunderstood by patrons	3	3.2
Program became controversial	2	2.1
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	94	100.0

abandonment by 19 or 0.6 per cent.

As is illustrated in Table LXXX, in the reasons for abandonment those related to personnel and administrative problems figured most prominently and were almost exactly evenly divided at 31.9 per cent and 31.8 per cent respectively. Leadership problems amounted to 12.8 per cent of all reported reasons. Other reasons playing an important role were: lack of teacher support; inadequate physical facilities; and scheduling complications which together amounted to 22.2 per cent of reported reasons.

Total pupil outcome reasons amounted to 22.4 per cent. Finance and patron acceptance problems played a relatively minor role in abandonment amounting to 7.5 per cent and 6.4 per cent.

Reasons for Abandonment of Cultural Enrichment Programs

Programs designed to provide exposure to cultural experiences for the student who otherwise might not have the opportunity to participate, were found in 31 per cent of the schools Cawelti studied. Abandonment was reported by 0.3 per cent. North Central schools totaling 734 or 22.4 per cent of those responding to this study reported adoption while 24 or 0.7 per cent had abandoned the practice.

Financial problems, as shown in Table LXXXI, were reported as 26.5 per cent of the causes for abandonment with the withdrawal of federal funding being the single most important reason and accounting for 14.7 per cent. Personnel and administrative problems contributed almost exactly

TABLE LXXXI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF CULTURAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	2	2.9
Federal funds could not be secured	1	1.5
Federal funds were discontinued	10	14.7
Local funding was discontinued	1	1.5
Other financial reasons	4	5.9
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	2	2.9
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	3	4.4
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	2.9
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	1.5
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	2.9
Teachers did not support the program	3	4.4
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	3	4.4
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	3	4.4
Objectives were not clearly stated	2	2.9
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	3	4.4
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	3	4.4
Physical facilities were not suitable	3	4.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	1.5
Other administrative reasons	1	1.5
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	0	0.0
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	4	5.9
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	1.5
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	1.5
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	1	1.5
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.5
Program was misunderstood by patrons	4	5.9
Program became controversial	3	4.4
Community opposed program expenditures	2	2.9
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	1.5
Total	68	100.1

equally to abandonment, with 23.4 per cent and 23.5 per cent, respectively.

Relatively minor impact on abandonment was felt from pupil outcome problems and problems of patron acceptance with these categories totaling 26.7 per cent combined. In these categories, scheduling complications and misunderstandings by patrons were the leading individual causes accounting for 5.4 per cent each.

Reasons for Abandonment of Optional Class Attendance

Allowing students a choice as to whether or not they will attend class regularly was reported by only 4 per cent of the schools in the Cawelti study and had been abandoned by 0.3 per cent. North Central schools included in this study reported adoption in 260 or 7.9 per cent and abandonment by 27 or 0.8 per cent.

Pupil outcome reasons amounted to 35.8 per cent of reasons for abandonment reported. Problems of pupil control and detrimental effects on achievement were the leading individual reasons amounting to 21.2 per cent of all reported reasons. Personnel reasons ranked second in causes of abandonment. Lack of teacher support was the most frequently reported individual reason.

A total of 21.2 per cent of reasons for abandonment were attributed to lack of acceptance by patrons, while financial problems played almost no part in abandonment. Administrative problems amounted to 18.2 per cent and inadequate public

TABLE LXXXII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF OPTIONAL CLASS ATTENDANCE

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	2	1.5
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	1	0.7
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	2	1.5
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	5	3.6
Building administrators did not support the innovation	5	3.6
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	0	0.0
Teachers did not support the program	13	9.5
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	1	0.7
Teachers were not adequately trained	4	2.9
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	0.7
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	6	4.4
Objectives were not clearly stated	3	2.2
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	0.7
Public relations activities were not adequate	7	5.1
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	3	2.2
Physical facilities were not suitable	2	1.5
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	1	0.7
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	1	0.7
Other administrative reasons	1	0.7
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	5	3.6
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	13	9.5
Program created scheduling complications	2	1.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	16	11.7
Program adversely affected pupil morale	6	4.4
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	6	4.4
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	1	0.7
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	6	4.4
Program was not accepted by parents	9	6.6
Program was misunderstood by patrons	6	4.4
Program became controversial	8	5.8
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	137	99.9

relations activities were indicated as reasons for abandonment in 5.1 of the total number reported.

Table LXXXII illustrates that human factors within the school accounted for 59 per cent of all stated reasons.

Reasons for Abandonment of Extended School Year

Making fuller and more efficient use of school facilities through the extended school year was reported adopted by 5.1 per cent of the schools in Cawelti's study and had been abandoned by 0.06 per cent. North Central schools indicated in this study reported adoption by only 79 or 2.4 per cent -- the fewest number of adoptions reported. Abandonment was reported by 8 or 0.2 per cent.

Financial problems were the largest single factor in abandonment amounting to 34.9 per cent of all reasons reported, as Table LXXXIII shows. Withdrawal of local and federal funding were the most important individual financial reasons.

Personnel problems of patron acceptance amounted to 52.1 per cent of reported reasons. Lack of teacher support, opposition from teacher organizations, misunderstanding by patrons and community opposition to expenditures were the most frequently reported individual reasons within these categories.

Administrative problems had no effect upon abandonment and problems of pupil outcomes played only a minor role, accounting for 13 per cent of reported reasons.

TABLE LXXXIII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	2	8.7
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	3	13.1
Local funding was discontinued	3	13.1
Other financial reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	1	4.3
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	0	0.0
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	0	0.0
Building administrators did not support the innovation	0	0.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	0	0.0
Teachers did not support the program	3	13.1
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	2	8.7
Teachers were not adequately trained	0	0.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	0	0.0
Objectives were not clearly stated	0	0.0
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	0	0.0
Public relations activities were not adequate	0	0.0
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	0	0.0
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	2	8.7
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	0	0.0
Program created scheduling complications	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	4.3
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	0	0.0
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	0	0.0
Program was not accepted by parents	1	4.3
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	8.7
Program became controversial	1	4.3
Community opposed program expenditures	2	8.7
Other patron acceptance reasons	0	0.0
Total	23	100.0

Reasons for Abandonment of Action Learning

Action learning is a relatively new concept including both work-study and the broader view of social service and other organized contacts between students and the adult world. Cawelti's study included only work-study programs and reported adoption by 48.9 per cent of responding schools and abandonment by 1.6 per cent. North Central schools in this study reported adoption by 1,864 or 57 per cent of responding schools and abandonment by only 24 or 0.7 per cent.

Although Table LXXXIV shows reported reasons for abandonment were fairly evenly distributed among the five categories, problems related to personnel accounted for 25.5 per cent. Leadership problems were responsible for 10.2 per cent of reported reasons. Financial problems were reported as 23.8 per cent of causes for abandonment, with expenditures not justified by benefits being the single most often reported reason. Pupil outcome reasons accounted for 22.1 per cent of all reported causes for abandonment.

Playing a lesser role were reasons related to administration and patron acceptance which amounted to 17 per cent and 11.9 per cent, respectively.

Reasons for Abandonment of Early Leaving Plans

Early leaving plans which allow the student to complete graduation requirements in less than thirty-six months of attendance between grades 9 and 12 were rather popular in the responding schools in this study with 1,911 or 58.4 per cent of the schools having adopted the practice. Only 19 or

TABLE LXXXIV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF ACTION LEARNING

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	5	8.4
Federal funds could not be secured	2	3.4
Federal funds were discontinued	1	1.7
Local funding was discontinued	3	5.1
Other financial reasons	3	5.1
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	4	6.8
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	2	3.4
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	3.4
Building administrators did not support the innovation	1	1.7
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	2	3.4
Teachers did not support the program	1	1.7
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	1	1.7
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	1	1.7
Other personnel reasons	1	1.7
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	1	1.7
Objectives were not clearly stated	4	6.8
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	1.7
Public relations activities were not adequate	2	3.4
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	1.7
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	1	1.7
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	3	5.1
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	2	3.4
Program created scheduling complications	0	0.0
Program adversely affected pupil control	3	5.1
Program adversely affected pupil morale	1	1.7
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	1	1.7
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	0	0.0
Other pupil reasons	3	5.1
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	3	5.1
Program was not accepted by parents	1	1.7
Program was misunderstood by patrons	1	1.7
Program became controversial	1	1.7
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	1.7
Total	59	100.2

0.6 per cent reported abandonment.

As illustrated in Table LXXXV pupil outcome problems made up the leading cause of abandonment, amounting to 37.1 per cent of all reported reasons. The most often reported individual reason dealt with complications created in high school/college transition -- amounting to 8.6 per cent.

Patron acceptance problems ranked second among categories of reasons for abandonment. Controversy over the program was the most often reported individual patron acceptance reason accounting for 11.4 per cent of all reasons reported.

Personnel problems figured in 15.8 per cent of stated reasons for abandonment, with lack of teacher acceptance the most important individual reason. Financial difficulties and administrative problems played a relatively small role in abandonment, amounting to 7.2 per cent and 11.3 per cent, respectively.

Reasons for Abandonment of Innovations in Order of Relative Frequency

Table LXXXVI summarizes the reasons for abandonment of the thirty-three selected innovations in order of relative frequency reported. Lack of support by teachers was the single most often reported reason for abandonment of innovations, accounting for 613 or 7.8 per cent of all reasons reported. Other reasons which accounted for approximately half of all reasons reported were: benefits which did not justify costs; lack of acceptance by students; inadequate

TABLE LXXXV

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF EARLY LEAVING PLAN

Reasons	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program		
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	3	4.3
Federal funds could not be secured	0	0.0
Federal funds were discontinued	0	0.0
Local funding was discontinued	0	0.0
Other financial reasons	2	2.9
Reasons Related to Personnel		
Necessary leadership was not available	0	0.0
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	2	2.9
Central Office support for the innovation was not forthcoming	2	2.9
Building administrators did not support the innovation	2	2.9
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	1	1.4
Teachers did not support the program	4	5.7
Teachers' organizations opposed the change	0	0.0
Teachers were not adequately trained	0	0.0
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	0	0.0
Other personnel reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Administration		
Preliminary planning was not adequate	1	1.4
Objectives were not clearly stated	4	5.7
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	1	1.4
Public relations activities were not adequate	1	1.4
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	0	0.0
Physical facilities were not suitable	1	1.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	0	0.0
Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education	0	0.0
Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies	0	0.0
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	0	0.0
Other administrative reasons	0	0.0
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes		
Students did not accept the new program	1	1.4
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	5	7.1
Program created scheduling complications	4	5.7
Program adversely affected pupil control	2	2.9
Program adversely affected pupil morale	2	2.9
Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs	5	7.1
Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils	6	8.6
Other pupil reasons	1	1.4
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons		
The board of education did not support the program	5	7.1
Program was not accepted by parents	4	5.7
Program was misunderstood by patrons	2	2.9
Program became controversial	8	11.4
Community opposed program expenditures	0	0.0
Other patron acceptance reasons	1	1.4
Total	70	99.9

training of teachers; lack of necessary leadership; changes in leadership personnel; unsatisfactory physical facilities; scheduling complications; detrimental effects on pupil achievement; other varied reasons related to pupils. It will be noted that the majority of these reasons are related to either staff personnel or pupil outcome reasons.

As Table LXXXVI illustrates, abandonment was seldom related to: community opposition, violation of state departments of education or North Central Association regulations, problems of administering the program, the lack of federal funding, or organized opposition from teacher organizations.

Reasons for Abandonment by General Classification of Reasons

The largest category of reasons for abandonment (Table LXXXVII) was related to staff personnel problems, accounting for 34.4 per cent of all reasons reported. This category dealt with: leadership problems, lack of teacher support, inadequate teacher training and lack of support by superordinates.

Problems with pupil outcomes made up the second largest category with 26 per cent of all reasons reported included in this category. Problems were included such as: lack of student acceptance; problems with pupil achievement, control, and morale; conflicts which developed with student schedules. In all, reasons related to personnel and pupil outcomes accounted for 60.4 per cent of all stated reasons for abandonment.

Problems in administering the programs accounted for

TABLE LXXXVI

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF THIRTY-THREE SELECTED INNOVATIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS IN ORDER OF RELATIVE FREQUENCY

Reasons	f	%
Teachers did not support the program	613	7.8
Benefits of the program did not justify the costs	559	7.2
Students did not accept the program	535	6.8
Teachers were not adequately trained	415	5.3
Necessary leadership was not available	409	5.2
Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed	379	4.8
Physical facilities were not suitable	343	4.4
Other varied reasons related to pupils	303	3.9
Program created scheduling complications	300	3.8
Program was detrimental to pupil achievement	291	3.7
Preliminary planning was inadequate	275	3.5
Program adversely affected pupil control	262	3.3
In-service training was not provided or was inadequate	248	3.2
Objectives were not clearly stated	239	3.1
Other varied reasons related to personnel	235	3.0
Competent specialists and support personnel were not available	199	2.5
Program adversely affected pupil morale	189	2.4
Other varied reasons related to administration	184	2.4
Adequate materials and equipment were not provided	166	2.1
Program became controversial	141	1.8
Program was misunderstood by patrons	138	1.8
Program was not accepted by parents	137	1.8
Other varied reasons related to finance	136	1.8
Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified	132	1.7
Local funding was discontinued	131	1.7
Program was detrimental to ongoing programs	104	1.3
Federal funds were discontinued	95	1.2
Central office support was not forthcoming	88	1.1
Building administrators did not support program	87	1.1
Board of education did not support the program	83	1.1
Public relations activities were not adequate	80	1.0
Other varied reasons related to patron acceptance	70	0.8
Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory	63	0.8
Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available	59	0.8
Program complicated high school/college transition	55	0.7
Federal funds could not be secured	32	0.4
Teacher organizations opposed the change	17	0.2
Community opposed program expenditures	15	0.2
Project practices were discouraged by state department of education	10	0.1
Project practices violated regulations of regional accrediting agency	7	0.1
Total	7,824	99.9

19.9 per cent of reasons for abandonment reported. This category included such reasons as: inadequate preliminary planning; lack of clearly stated objectives, cumbersome administrative detail; inadequate physical facilities; inadequate materials and equipment and lack of necessary public relations activities.

While benefits which did not justify costs was the second most often reported reason for abandonment, overall reasons related to finance amounted to only 12.2 per cent of all reasons for abandonment reported. Likewise, reasons related to patron acceptance had little overall effect on abandonment amounting to only 7.5 per cent of all reported reasons.

TABLE LXXXVII

REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION OF REASONS

Classification	f	%
Reasons Related to Financing the Program	953	12.2
Reasons Related to Personnel	2,690	34.4
Reasons Related to Administration	1,558	19.9
Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes	2,039	26.0
Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons	584	7.5
Total	7,824	100.0

Data Derived from Follow-up Questionnaire

Tables LXXXVIII - XCII illustrate data derived from a second questionnaire mailed to those schools which indicated adoption of at least one of the thirty-three innovations included in the first questionnaire. Questionnaires were mailed to a total of 3,035 schools. Returns were received from 2,647 or 87.2 per cent of the schools in the second population. Of this number, 2,469 were usable.

Student Population for Which Innovation Was Designed

The student population for which each innovation was designed is described in Table LXXXVIII. Only independent study programs and college credit courses were offered in a majority of schools to students on the basis of academic achievement.

In the main, these programs were open to the general student population with the following innovations reported offered to students on this basis in a majority of schools making the adoption: Harvard Physics, ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, IPS Physical Science, humanities courses, career education, mini-courses, HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, ethnic studies, television instruction, simulation or gaming, flexible scheduling, and cultural enrichment programs.

Few innovations were offered to a significant number of students on the basis of career interest. Only data processing equipment, optional class attendance, and action learning were designed for students on the basis of career

TABLE LXXXVIII

STUDENT POPULATION FOR WHICH INNOVATION WAS DESIGNED

Innovation	Students Selected on Basis of Academic Achievement		General Student Body		Students Selected on Basis of Career Choices		Other	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	257	39.4	245	37.6	64	9.8	86	13.2
Harvard Physics	117	26.1	243	54.2	40	8.9	48	10.7
ESCP Physical Science	40	14.2	209	74.4	9	3.2	23	8.2
SSSP Physical Science	16	25.4	36	57.1	5	7.9	6	9.5
IPS Physical Science	130	20.3	428	66.9	24	3.6	58	9.1
Humanities Course	158	20.2	518	66.3	26	4.1	79	12.3
Career Education	27	2.3	817	70.6	195	16.8	119	10.3
Independent Study	848	56.6	366	24.4	102	6.8	181	12.1
Mini-Courses	47	4.3	885	81.3	33	3.0	123	11.3
Learning Packages	242	32.7	327	44.2	99	13.4	161	21.8
HSGP Geography	9	6.8	115	86.5	3	2.3	6	4.5
IPI	73	43.5	62	36.1	11	6.5	22	13.1
SRSS Sociology	10	7.0	105	73.9	9	6.3	18	12.7
Ethnic Studies	22	3.1	601	84.1	12	1.7	80	11.2
Television Instruction	34	11.7	178	61.4	45	15.5	33	11.4
Programmed Instruction	198	47.3	109	26.0	47	11.2	65	15.5
Teaching Machines	68	35.1	61	31.4	33	17.0	32	16.5
Telephone Amplification	12	12.8	35	37.2	17	18.1	30	31.9
Simulation or Gaming	120	17.2	448	64.3	53	7.6	76	10.9
Data Processing Equipment	68	13.0	213	40.6	188	35.9	55	10.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	64	33.9	54	28.6	47	24.9	24	12.7
Flexible Scheduling	6	4.9	101	82.8	8	6.6	7	5.7
Team Teaching	351	24.1	580	39.8	233	16.0	295	20.2
College Credit Courses	243	81.0	28	9.3	11	3.7	18	6.0
Non-Graded Programs	18	27.3	26	39.4	5	7.6	17	25.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	92	24.5	150	40.0	58	15.5	75	20.0
Differentiated Staffing	3	18.8	8	50.0	1	6.3	4	25.0
School-Within-A-School	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	11	19.0	40	69.0	4	6.9	3	5.2
Optional Class Attendance	4	30.8	1	7.7	4	30.8	4	30.8
Extended School Year	1	14.3	3	42.9	1	14.3	2	28.6
Action Learning	51	29.0	51	29.0	59	33.5	15	8.5
Early Leaving Plan	78	27.6	85	30.0	51	18.0	69	24.1
Total	3,420	24.7	7,131	54.0	1,497	10.8	1,834	13.2

choices in over 25 per cent of all responding schools.

Degree of Implementation

Table LXXXIX illustrates the nature of implementation of programs reported fully implemented. Five of the innovations were offered in a majority of schools for a specialized group of students. These were: programmed instruction, teaching machines, college credit courses, optional class attendance, and early leaving plans.

The following innovations were offered on an elective basis in a majority of schools reporting adoption: PSSC Physics, Harvard Physics, SSSP Physical Science, humanities courses, HSGP Geography, SRSS Sociology, and ethnic studies. Only flexible scheduling and the extended school year were reported by a majority of schools adopting these innovations as required of all students.

Table XC illustrates to what degree innovations being tried on a limited basis had been implemented. The largest specified category of responses dealing with this section of the questionnaire indicated that the innovations were provided to a few specially selected students. Programs or practices most often reported designed for selected students were: independent study, team teaching, learning packages, programmed instruction, career education, college credit courses, and data processing equipment.

The third largest category of responses dealt with the number of innovations which were being tried as pilot programs to determine if full implementation should follow

TABLE LXXXIX

DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF INNOVATIONS REPORTED FULLY IMPLEMENTED

Innovation	Serves a Specialized Group of Students		Elective Course		Required of All Students		Offered each Year		Offered on Alternate Years		Other	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	189	28.7	331	50.3	10	1.5	109	16.6	8	1.2	11	1.7
Harvard Physics	87	19.4	289	64.4	4	1.1	60	13.4	5	1.1	4	1.1
FSCP Physical Science	34	7.7	131	29.8	65	14.8	40	9.0	0	0.0	5	1.1
SSSP Physical Science	13	25.0	27	51.9	4	7.7	4	7.7	0	0.0	4	7.7
IPS Physical Science	89	14.2	240	38.2	188	29.9	99	15.8	4	0.6	8	1.3
Humanities Course	112	13.9	516	64.0	51	6.3	104	12.9	9	1.1	14	1.7
Career Education	163	13.4	500	41.1	258	21.1	184	15.1	1	0.1	114	9.3
Independent Study	616	48.7	348	27.5	50	4.1	197	15.6	4	0.3	49	3.9
Mini-Courses	78	7.5	376	36.3	374	36.1	152	14.7	12	1.2	43	4.2
Learning Packages	245	34.5	229	31.9	148	20.6	68	9.5	2	0.2	26	3.6
HSGP Geography	7	5.4	93	71.5	14	10.7	13	0.1	2	1.5	1	0.8
IPI	50	34.5	52	35.9	16	11.0	21	14.5	0	0.0	6	4.1
SRSS Sociology	6	2.1	119	65.9	7	2.4	11	3.8	1	0.3	1	0.3
Ethnic Studies	35	4.9	518	73.1	69	9.7	69	9.7	7	1.0	11	1.6
Television Instruction	68	25.8	107	40.5	39	14.8	33	12.5	0	0.0	17	6.4
Programmed Instruction	199	55.0	91	25.1	36	9.9	24	6.6	1	0.2	11	3.0
Teaching Machines	107	60.1	41	23.0	20	11.2	6	3.4	0	0.0	4	2.3
Telephone Amplification	33	3.9	12	15.6	14	18.2	7	9.1	1	1.3	10	13.1
Simulation or Gaming	123	17.1	306	42.6	201	28.0	47	6.5	1	0.1	41	5.7
Data Processing Equipment	134	28.9	220	47.5	24	5.2	58	12.5	0	0.0	27	5.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	68	39.5	78	45.3	5	2.9	15	8.7	1	0.6	5	2.9
Flexible Scheduling	7	6.4	8	7.3	67	61.5	23	21.1	0	0.0	4	3.6
Team Teaching	263	23.8	283	25.6	329	29.7	122	11.1	1	0.1	110	9.9
College Credit Courses	176	70.1	38	15.1	3	1.2	27	10.8	2	0.8	5	2.1
Non-Graded Programs	21	38.2	16	29.1	9	16.4	8	14.5	0	0.0	1	1.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	128	39.5	43	13.3	55	17.1	74	22.8	0	0.0	24	7.4
Differentiated Staffing	6	37.5	5	31.2	2	12.5	2	12.5	0	0.0	1	6.3
School-Within-A-School	2	22.2	1	11.1	4	44.4	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	15	26.3	24	42.1	10	17.5	6	10.5	0	0.0	2	3.5
Optional Class Attendance	4	57.1	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Extended School Year	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Action Learning	63	45.7	39	28.3	13	9.4	18	13.0	1	0.7	4	2.9
Early Leaving Plan	118	50.4	6	2.6	16	6.8	86	36.8	0	0.0	8	3.4
Total	3,260	25.5	5,089	39.8	2,108	16.5	1,691	13.2	63	0.5	571	4.5

later. Programs most often reported being tried on a pilot basis were: team teaching, learning packages, simulation or gaming, career education, humanities courses, programmed instruction, and independent study.

Few of the innovations in the study were reported as being tried on a temporary basis with responses in this category amounting to only 17.8 per cent of the total. The individual programs most often reported being offered on a temporary basis were: team teaching, mini-courses, independent study, career education, learning packages, simulation or gaming, and humanities courses.

Duration of Abandoned Innovations

Table XCI deals with the length of time abandoned innovations were in use before being discontinued by responding schools. The data illustrated in this table indicate that when the innovations in this study were abandoned, such abandonment occurred most often following a trial period of one to three years.

Few innovations were abandoned following a trial of less than one year. Of all responses, those indicating abandonment after less than one year amounted to only 5.8 per cent of total responses with team teaching being the most often reported.

Innovations abandoned after one full year of trial amounted to 293 or 18.3 per cent of all responses. Those most often reported abandoned after one year were: team teaching, humanities courses, programmed instruction, mini-courses, and flexible scheduling.

TABLE XC

DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF INNOVATIONS REPORTED BEING TRIED ON A LIMITED BASIS

Innovation	Pilot Program		Limited to Selected Students		Offered on a Temporary Basis		Other	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	16	10.5	47	30.9	18	11.8	71	46.7
Harvard Physics	25	25.0	23	23.0	13	13.0	39	39.0
ESCP Physical Science	14	24.1	6	10.3	6	10.3	32	55.2
SSSP Physical Science	9	37.5	6	25.0	5	20.8	4	16.6
IPS Physical Science	34	24.6	20	14.5	20	14.5	64	46.4
Humanities Course	62	33.2	32	17.1	36	19.3	57	30.5
Career Education	67	20.4	62	18.9	57	17.4	142	43.3
Independent Study Programs	53	8.8	378	63.1	69	11.5	99	16.5
Mini-Courses	84	25.9	15	4.6	90	27.8	135	41.7
Learning Packages	122	33.0	103	27.8	58	15.7	87	23.5
HSGP Geography	13	41.9	2	6.5	6	19.4	10	32.3
IPI	27	32.1	23	27.4	15	17.9	19	22.6
SRSS Sociology	7	18.9	10	27.0	9	24.3	11	29.7
Ethnic Studies	40	26.1	14	9.2	29	19.0	70	45.8
Television Instruction	26	23.4	29	26.1	21	18.9	35	31.5
Programmed Instruction	60	30.9	76	39.1	30	15.5	28	14.4
Teaching Machines	19	26.0	28	38.4	6	8.2	20	27.4
Telephone Amplification	14	33.3	16	38.1	11	26.2	11	26.2
Simulation or Gaming	98	33.8	46	15.9	57	19.7	89	30.7
Data Processing Equipment	33	21.6	54	35.3	22	14.4	44	28.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	17	22.4	32	42.1	7	9.2	20	26.3
Flexible Scheduling	4	14.3	3	10.7	7	25.0	14	50.0
Team Teaching	187	32.6	15	19.9	127	22.0	147	25.5
College Credit Courses	17	14.2	78	65.0	13	10.8	12	1.0
Non-Graded Programs	6	33.3	4	22.2	1	5.5	7	38.8
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	18	15.7	40	34.8	28	24.3	29	25.2
Differentiated Staffing	2	40.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
School-Within-A-School	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3
Cultural Enrichment Program	8	34.8	5	21.7	5	21.7	5	21.7
Optional Class Attendance	3	37.5	2	25.0	1	12.5	2	25.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
Action Learning	24	32.4	23	31.1	15	20.3	12	16.2
Early Leaving Plan	3	3.8	38	48.1	19	24.1	19	24.1
Total	1,113	25.1	1,261	28.0	802	17.8	1,324	29.4

More than half of all innovations abandoned by respondents to this questionnaire were abandoned following a trial of one to three years. The innovations most often reported abandoned after such a trial period were: team teaching, PSSC Physics, humanities courses, flexible scheduling, programmed instruction, television instruction, independent study programs, and teacher aides or paraprofessionals.

The length of time innovations were in use before abandonment fell in an almost even distribution as can be seen from an examination of Table XCI. Those innovations abandoned after a trial of four to five years almost exactly matched those abandoned following a trial of one year. Innovations abandoned after five years numbered only slightly more than those abandoned after less than one year. Those innovations most often reported abandoned after a trial of four to five years were: PSSC Physics, team teaching, humanities courses, and IPS Physical Science. Those most often abandoned after five years were: PSSC Physics, team teaching, and television instruction.

Source of Abandoned Innovations

The source of the abandoned innovation is illustrated in Table XCII. Over half of the responses to this question indicated that innovations abandoned had been locally developed. Among these the following were reported most often abandoned: team teaching, humanities courses, flexible scheduling, mini-courses, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, and independent study.

TABLE XCI

LENGTH OF TIME INNOVATION WAS IN USE BEFORE ABANDONMENT

Innovation	Less than One Year		One Year		1-3 Years		4-5 Years		More than 5 Years	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	2	0.9	10	4.8	98	46.7	63	30.0	37	17.6
Harvard Physics	0	0.0	1	4.8	15	71.4	3	14.3	2	9.5
ESCP Physical Science	0	0.0	4	16.0	11	44.0	6	24.0	4	16.0
SSSP Physical Science	1	8.3	3	25.0	5	41.7	2	16.7	1	8.3
IPS Physical Science	1	1.5	8	12.1	32	48.5	22	33.3	3	4.5
Humanities Course	4	2.9	29	21.0	70	50.7	27	19.6	8	5.8
Career Education	2	18.2	3	27.3	5	45.5	1	9.1	0	0.0
Independent Study Programs	1	1.8	13	22.8	39	68.4	3	5.3	1	1.8
Mini-Courses	9	12.5	23	31.9	33	45.8	7	9.7	0	0.0
Learning Packages	8	18.2	10	22.7	22	50.0	3	6.8	1	2.3
HSGP Geography	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	0	0.0
IPI	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SRSS Sociology	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	5	10.9	10	21.7	24	52.1	7	15.2	0	0.0
Television Instruction	3	3.8	7	9.0	37	47.4	20	25.6	11	14.1
Programmed Instruction	2	2.2	26	29.2	45	50.6	14	15.7	2	2.2
Teaching Machines	6	16.2	6	16.2	2	5.4	2	5.4	1	2.7
Telephone Amplification	1	5.3	1	5.3	13	68.4	4	21.0	0	0.0
Simulation or Gaming	0	0.0	4	44.4	5	55.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Data Processing Equipment	8	13.1	10	16.4	31	50.8	5	8.2	7	11.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	3	10.4	8	27.6	16	55.2	1	3.4	1	3.4
Flexible Scheduling	5	5.0	22	19.3	48	47.5	19	18.8	7	6.9
Team Teaching	14	5.8	44	18.2	41	58.3	51	21.1	12	5.1
College Credit Courses	3	7.1	7	16.7	17	40.5	6	14.3	10	23.8
Non-Graded Programs	0	0.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	4	10.0	1	10.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	2	2.8	15	21.1	38	53.5	14	19.7	2	2.8
Differentiated Staffing	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	2	15.4	3	23.1	6	46.2	2	15.4	0	0.0
Cultural Enrichment Program	0	0.0	4	36.4	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	9.1
Optional Class Attendance	4	28.[illegible]	6	42.9	2	14.3	2	14.3	0	0.0
Extended School Year	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Action Learning	3	18.8	4	25.0	8	50.0	1	6.3	0	0.0
Early Leaving Plan	1	9.1	1	9.1	5	45.5	2	18.2	1	9.1
Total	92	6.8	293	18.3	802	50.2	297	18.6	113	7.1

Commercially produced innovations reported abandoned accounted for 25.9 per cent of all abandonment reported by respondents to this questionnaire. Those innovations most often reported abandoned which had come from commercial sources were: PSSC Physics, programmed instruction, IPS Physical Science, teaching machines, television instruction, data processing equipment, and ESCP Physical Science.

The smallest number of abandoned innovations had been developed from a combination of local and commercial sources. Of these, the following were reported most often abandoned: PSSC Physics, team teaching, flexible scheduling, IPS Physical Science, programmed instruction, television instruction, and data processing equipment.

Modifications Made in Innovations Later Abandoned By Responding Schools

In the vast majority of cases, responding schools reported implementation and operation of innovations without any effort to modify. Those modifications reported are listed below:

PSSC Physics: Most modifications of this program consisted of combining the best features of PSSC Physics with those of other programs. Modifications reported were:

1. Adaptation of some units, materials, and equipment to traditional programs was made.
2. Some units were eliminated.
3. Adaptation of some labs to other physics courses was made.

TABLE XCII

SOURCE OF INNOVATION REPORTED ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Innovation	Locally Developed		Commerically Produced		Combination	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
PSSC Physics	18	9.0	119	59.5	63	31.5
Harvard Physics	1	4.8	13	61.9	7	33.3
ESCP Physical Science	3	12.0	15	60.0	7	28.0
SSSP Physical Science	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3
IPS Physical Science	6	9.2	38	58.5	21	32.3
Humanities Course	116	86.6	4	3.1	14	10.4
Career Education	6	60.0	1	10.0	3	30.0
Independent Study Program	52	92.9	0	0.0	4	7.1
Mini-Courses	66	94.3	0	0.0	4	5.7
Learning Packages	25	58.1	7	16.1	11	25.6
HSGP Geography	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
IPI	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
SRSS Sociology	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Ethnic Studies	36	80.0	1	2.2	8	17.8
Television Instruction	27	37.5	27	37.5	18	25.0
Programmed Instruction	17	18.7	55	60.4	19	20.9
Teaching Machines	7	18.4	26	68.4	4	10.5
Telephone Amplification	8	44.4	6	33.3	4	22.2
Simulation or Gaming	2	22.2	6	66.6	1	11.1
Data Processing Equipment	0	0.0	42	71.2	17	28.8
Computer Assisted Instruction	10	40.0	5	20.0	10	40.0
Flexible Scheduling	69	72.6	5	5.3	21	22.1
Team Teaching	206	88.4	0	0.0	27	11.6
College Credit Courses	24	63.2	7	18.4	7	18.4
Non-Graded Programs	9	90.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals	60	93.8	3	4.7	1	1.6
Differentiated Staffing	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
School-Within-A-School	10	83.3	0	0.0	2	16.7
Cultural Enrichment Program	8	72.7	1	9.1	2	18.2
Optional Class Attendance	12	92.3	0	0.0	1	7.6
Extended School Year	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Action Learning	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0
Early Leaving Plan	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	830	55.1	390	25.9	285	18.9

4. Use of special labs for special problems in other physics courses was adopted.
5. A blend of PSSC Physics and traditional programs was achieved.
6. Adaptation of different demonstrations and laboratory exercises to the program was made.
7. PSSC was supplemented with more readable textbooks.
8. Traditional physics was used to supplement during the transition period after adoption.
9. Program was modified to make the program easier for some students.
10. Lack of equipment made some modification necessary.
11. Incorporation of traditional physics units into PSSC Physics was achieved.
12. PSSC was combined with Harvard Physics.
13. PSSC was enriched with modules from other programs.
14. Declining enrollment in both programs resulted in combining PSSC with traditional physics.
15. PSSC was combined with the best features of Harvard Project Physics and traditional physics.

Harvard Physics: The few modifications reported for this innovation were similar to those reported for PSSC Physics and are as follows:

1. The cost of equipment caused principles to be taught by different means.
2. PSSC texts were used as a resource.
3. Students were placed on academic contracts.

4. Harvard Physics was used as a supplement to existing program.
5. Harvard Physics was supplemented with different labs from other programs.

ESCP Physical Science: Modifications reported were:

1. The program was locally developed and based on the principles of ESCP Physical Science.
2. A blend of ESCP Physical Science with other programs was achieved.
3. The use of mathematics as called for in the text was reduced.
4. ESCP materials were adapted for use in the physics program.

SSSP Physical Science: Only one school reported modification of this innovation. The modification introduced consisted of simplifying the program because of cost factors.

IPS Physical Science: The following modifications were reported:

1. Regular laboratory equipment was used rather than commercially prepared sets.
2. IPS became one component of a unified science approach.
3. Some experiments were replaced and supplemented the text with more easily read materials.
4. Emphasis was changed from small group to a completely individualized approach to IPS.

Humanities Courses: Several changes were introduced in humanities programs as illustrated below. Most changes consisted of supplemental materials, methods, or personnel.

1. A more comprehensive program was developed including art, music, religion, cultures, history, and poetry.
2. Humanities was incorporated into an existing social studies program.
3. Program changed from emphasis on world humanities to American humanities.
4. Team teaching was incorporated into program.
5. Selection of students was modified in favor of the more talented.
6. The team teaching feature was abandoned.
7. Teaming with social studies was eliminated.
8. It is now taught exclusively through the English department.

Career Education: This innovation, one of the most successful in the study, had received few modifications. Those changes which were made were as follows:

1. Career education has been absorbed entirely into vocational program.
2. Now offered as an individual program twice weekly through activity period rather than permeating the entire curriculum.

Independent Study Programs: The modifications reported for independent study programs were:

1. Refinement of evaluation procedures has taken place.
2. Complete independence was not successful. Students were assigned to work with a teacher on a one-to-one basis.
3. Teachers are now required to provide closer contact with students in the program.

Mini-Courses: Modifications of mini-courses were:

1. Program is modified each year to reflect students needs as perceived by students and staff.
2. A succession of mini-courses were combined into a semester program.
3. Closer monitoring of student attendance is now in effect.
4. Greater student involvement is incorporated into design of programs.

Learning Packages: Only two modifications for this innovation were reported:

1. The concept was incorporated into mathematics and career education only.
2. Learning packages are now used as a unit of work rather than a strategy for the entire year.

HSGP Geography: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

IPI: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

SRSS Sociology: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Ethnic Studies: Most modifications of this innovation involved combining the program with existing programs. The modifications reported were:

1. The content of the ethnic studies program was added to existing programs.
2. Now used as a supplement to an American literature course.
3. An extensive resource library was established.
4. A black instructor was employed and the emphasis changed to Afro-American studies.
5. The course was broaded to include a humanities program of minority studies.
6. Now used as a unit in U. S. Government classes.

Television Instruction: Modifications in this innovation were:

1. Now used only in an incidental manner.
2. Television lectures now are supplemental with local teacher.
3. Television presentation is combined with well-organized classroom programs designed to follow directly the television program.

Programmed Instruction: Modifications were as follows:

1. Now used in remedial and accelerated mathematics programs only.
2. Extensive teacher in-service was necessary to correct abuses.

3. More careful selection of students for the program was needed.
4. Teacher is now required to be present at all times as a resource person to assist students.

Teaching Machines: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Telephone Amplification: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Simulation or Gaming: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Data Processing Equipment: Only two modifications were reported and were as follows:

1. Now used for scheduling activity period only. No longer directly accessable for instruction.
2. Students now schedule themselves from a master schedule made by a faculty committee.

Computer Assisted Instruction: Only one modification was reported:

> Some of the time-sharing functions were done on a "batch" basis.

Flexible Scheduling: The following innovations were reported for this innovation:

1. Some students are scheduled in three hour blocks instead of short segments.
2. School changed to a traditional - college variable modular schedule.

3. Schedule was changed to a floating period plan.
4. Schedule was changed to an alternative schedule for potential dropouts.
5. A teacher-student scheduling plan was adopted.
6. Program was modified to a double floating period.
7. Small and large group instruction continues to be used, other features were abandoned.
8. Plan was changed to a combination of traditional, flexible, teacher demand, and modular.
9. Flexible schedule runs concurrent with traditional schedule.
10. The length of mods has been changed.
11. The philosophy was retained but now classes meet each day.

Team Teaching: The largest number of modifications were reported for this innovation. They were:

1. Teachers were selected who were more compatible.
2. The portion of the schedule devoted to team teaching was rearranged and reduced.
3. A team composed of mathematics and physics teachers was assigned to the physics class. Other teams were eliminated.
4. Student assistants are now used in small group sessions.
5. A complete change of staff, courses, and materials was achieved.

6. Was kept on a pilot basis with two teachers.
7. Is confined to only two departments now.
8. Now involves entire ninth and tenth grades.
9. A more flexible organizational structure was created.
10. It is used only periodically now.
11. Now used in different ways as determined by subject matter, courses, teams.
12. The number of teams was reduced and eliminated the cross-discipline approach.
13. The number of teams was greatly reduced in order to salvage any of the practice at all.

College Credit Courses: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Non-Graded Programs: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Teacher Aides-Paraprofessionals: The modifications reported for this innovation were as follows:

1. Aides have been retained for resource center only.
2. Aides are now used in developmental reading laboratory only.
3. Student aides only are used now.
4. Negotiations limit the school to aides only, paraprofessionals have been eliminated.
5. The program was modified in order to be supported by local funds when federal funds were withdrawn.

Differentiated Staffing: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

School-Within-A-School: The modifications reported for this practice were:

> Only the concept remains, space is no longer designated. The practice is primarily used for those with behavioral problems.

Cultural Enrichment Programs: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Optional Class Attendance: The only modification reported was:

> The decision was left with the individual teacher depending on the material to be covered.

Extended School Year: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Action Learning: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Early Leaving Plan: No modifications were reported for this innovation.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the analysis and results of processing the data gathered from subjects included in the population.

The results of the study indicated that, on the average, 9.7 of the thirty-three innovations had been adopted by responding schools while 0.76 had been abandoned. This compares with 6.1 and 1.7, respectively, in Cawelti's study of twenty-seven innovations.

Innovations showing a rather high degree of abandonment were: team teaching, PSSC Physics, humanities courses, flexible scheduling, and programmed instruction. Innovations both rather widely adopted and abandoned by relatively few schools were: early leaving plan, action learning, career education, and simulation and gaming which was the most durable innovation in the study.

In general, innovations most often abandoned tended to be rather complex, expensive, and relatively difficult to administer, while more durable innovations tended to be simpler, less expensive, and easier to staff and administer.

Curricular innovations were found to have been adopted by more schools than innovations in technology or organization. Just as in adoption, these innovations ranked first in abandonment followed by organizational innovations with technological changes ranking third.

Innovations tended to be found in greater numbers in larger schools with higher per-pupil expenditures for instructional purposes. This agrees with Cawelti's findings and with some of the early studies of Mort.

Government schools accredited by the North Central Association ranked first in adoption while public schools ranked last.

Unlike Cawelti's findings schools in large cities tended to rank slightly higher in adoption of innovations than did those in suburban communities, although suburban schools exceeded those in smaller cities. Schools in rural areas ranked last.

Abandonment of innovations was found to a greater degree in schools with enrollments of over 2,500 and with the highest per-pupil expenditures.

Private schools, not religious affiliated reported higher abandonment than did parochial, private, religious affiliated, or government schools. Public schools reported the lowest abandonment. As with adoption, schools in urban areas reported highest abandonments. Schools in small towns and rural areas reported lowest abandonment.

The majority of adoptions of innovations by North Central Association schools in this study took place after 1970. However, the larger the enrollment and the higher the per-pupil expenditure reported, the earlier adoption occurred. Innovations reported abandoned had been implemented in the majority of cases between 1965 and 1969.

Most of the impetus for the adoption of innovations, later abandoned, came from administrators. Teacher, students, and parents as a group ranked second, although student and parent involvement was rather limited. Overall, in the vast majority of cases the adoption of these innovations was influenced by persons within the school. Relatively little impact was reported from boards of education, government agencies, state departments of education, the North Central Association, publishing or media companies or the results of educational research.

Administrators tended to influence the adoption of organization innovations most. Teachers, students and parents as a group, regulatory agencies, publishing and media companies, and the results of educational research had their greatest impact upon the adoption of curricular innovations later abandoned. Boards of education influenced technological and organizational innovations more than curricular change.

Reasons related to personnel were most often reported for abandonment of innovations, with lack of support by teachers being the single most often reported individual reason. Problems with pupil outcomes made up the second largest category of reasons for abandonment. Administrative problems ranked third in reported reasons. Financial reasons and reasons related to acceptance by school patrons had relatively little effect upon abandonment. In all, 60.4 per cent of the reasons reported were related to these factors within the school.

The majority of innovations adopted were designed for the general student body. Those developed to serve students selected on the basis of academic achievement accounted for 24.7 per cent of all responses concerning student population, while innovations provided students on the basis of career choices accounted for only 10.8 per cent.

In the main, innovations which had been fully implemented were being offered on an elective basis available to the general student body. The second most often reported use of the innovations in the study was that of limiting programs to a specialized group of students. Only 16.5 per cent were reported as required programs. By contrast, programs being tried on a limited basis were most often offered to selected students or were being tried on a pilot basis.

Over half of all programs abandoned had been in use from one to three years. Only 5.8 per cent of abandoned innovations had been in use less than one year and only 7.1 per cent had been abandoned if in use for more than five years.

The majority of innovations abandoned had been developed locally, accounting for 55.1 per cent of abandoned innovations. Commercially developed programs accounted for 25.9 per cent of abandoned innovations while a combination of locally developed and commercially produced programs accounted for 18.9 per cent.

In most cases, responding schools reported no modification of innovations. In the instances were modifications were made, they generally consisted of combining some of the features of one program with another.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary of the Study

The purposes of this chapter are to summarize the data and to draw conclusions and implications based on the findings.

The primary questions of this study were: which of thirty-three selected innovations in the areas of curriculum, organization, and technology had been abandoned after trial by schools in the survey population; what were the stated reasons for abandonment; what are the implications for planning educational change; and what guidelines might be developed to determine the conditions necessary for probable success of prospective innovations?

In addition to the primary questions, answers were sought to the following specific questions:

1. Is school enrollment a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

2. Is the annual per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

3. Are the size and type of community in which the

school is located factors in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

4. Is the type of school (public, private, parochial, government) a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

5. Which of the general classifications of innovations of curriculum, organization, and technology were more commonly found in the schools of the survey population?

6. Which of the general classifications of innovations of curriculum, organization, and technology were abandoned most frequently?

7. To what extent are finance, personnel, administration, pupil outcomes, or patron acceptance factors in the durability of an innovation?

8. Is the original impetus for the adoption of innovations a factor in abandonment?

The initial step in the investigation of these problems involved a review of the related literature. Cawelti's study of the adoption of innovations by accredited high schools was especially helpful.

To obtain answers to the above questions, a questionnaire survey was conducted of the total population of 3,711 member secondary schools of the North Central Association. The instrument was first field tested among schools in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and, in part, followed the general format of the instrument used by Cawelti in his National Inventory of Secondary School Innovations. Returns were received from 3,476 schools for a total of 94.7 per cent. Of these, 3,271 were usable returns from which the data included in the study were derived.

A second questionnaire was mailed to the 3,035 schools which reported adoption of at least one of the thirty-three innovations.

The second survey instrument was designed to determine:

1. The student population for which the innovation was designed.
2. The degree of implementation of innovations adopted by responding schools.
3. The length of time each discontinued innovation was in use before being abandoned.
4. The source from which the innovation was developed.
5. What modifications of the innovation, if any, had been made by the adopting school.

A total of 2,647 questionnaires were returned of which 2,469 were usable.

Findings

Description of Responding Schools

The schools included in this study reported relatively large enrollments with 69.5 per cent having enrollments of 500 and above. Expenditures per-pupil in the majority of schools was $800 or more, with the most commonly reported interval being $800 to $1,500. Over 90 per cent of responding schools were public institutions and most were located in large communities with 64.4 per cent reported in suburban areas of communities 5,000 to over 400,000 residents. Thus, responding schools tended to be larger, moderate to well financed, public schools located mainly in communities other than small towns or rural areas.

Status of Innovations in Responding Schools

Responding schools reported higher adoption and lower abandonment than the schools in Cawelti's 1966 nationwide study. Schools included in this study reported adoption of an average of 9.7 of the thirty-three innovations while abandonment averaged 0.76. This compares with an average adoption of 6.1 and an average abandonment of 1.7 in Cawelti's study.

In general, innovations experiencing high abandonment were those which tended to be complex, expensive, and difficult to administer. Examples of this included PSSC Physics, flexible scheduling, programmed instruction, television instruction, humanities courses, data processing equipment, and team teaching. Conversely, innovations which tended to be more durable were simpler, less expensive, and relatively easier to administer. Examples of these were simulation or gaming, early leaving plan, action learning, learning packages, independent study programs, optional class attendance, and the ethnic studies. It will be noted that many of the more durable innovations were those which may be developed by individual teachers and which often may be implemented without affecting ongoing programs. This finding tends to agree with Brickel's findings that schools generally adopt innovations that do not require changes in the existing structural framework. With the exception of PSSC Physics and IPS Physical Science, packaged, commercially produced programs providing convenient access to most materials needed to implement the program were abandoned by relatively few schools.

When abandonment did occur, it came primarily as a result of reasons within the school related to personnel and pupil outcomes. Difficulties encountered in administering the innovations played a smaller role in abandonment while problems with patron acceptance or finance influenced abandonment only slightly.

Findings Relative to Research Questions

Within the limitations of the study the analysis of the data seems to justify the following answers to the questions of the study:

1. Is school enrollment a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

The data from the study indicate progressively greater adoption of innovations with increased enrollment. Responding schools with enrollments of fewer than 200 students reported an average of 7.8 innovations adopted per school. Schools with enrollments of 200-499 reported an average of

8.1 while those with enrollments of 500-1,499 averaged 10.2. In the two largest categories, schools with enrollments of 1,500-2,499 reported average adoptions of 13.9 while those with over 2,500 students had an average of 14.6 per school.

A less direct relationship was reported between enrollment and abandonment. Schools of under 200 students reported an average of 0.76 innovations abandoned while those with enrollments between 200 and 499 reported an average of 0.64. Other enrollment categories reported a pattern of increasing abandonment. Schools of 500-1,499 had abandoned an average of 0.74 innovations while those with 1,500-2,499 students had abandoned an average of 0.92. In the largest enrollment category of over 2,500 students, highest abandonment was reported with an average of 0.99 per school.

2. Is the annual per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes a factor in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

Adoption of innovations by schools participating in this study corresponded directly to per-pupil expenditures, agreeing with Cawelti's findings and the earlier studies on adoption of innovations.

In schools with expenditures of less than $500 per pupil the average number of innovations adopted was 8.6 As increased expenditures were reported, adoption also increased. Expenditures of $500-799 were associated with an average adoption of 9.2. Schools with expenditures of $800-$1,500 reported an average of 11.2 and those spending over $1,500 had adopted an average of 14.5 innovations.

It appears that those institutions which adopted the greater number of innovations also experienced a higher incidence of abandonment. Those with expenditures of less than $500 per pupil reported abandonment of 0.68 on the average. Other levels of expenditure and the average abandonment reported were: $500-$799 - 0.69; $800-$1,500 - 0.82; over $1,500 - 0.83 per school.

3. Are the size and type of community in which the school is located factors in the adoption or abandonment of innovations?

Adoption was not as directly related to the size and type of community served as was reported in relation to per-pupil expenditures. Schools in urban communities reported highest adoption with those located in cities of over 400,000 adopting an average of 13.2 innovations. Other classifications of schools and their corresponding average adoptions were: communities of 300,000 to 399,999 - 12.4; 200,000 to 299,999 - 13.3; 100,000 to 199,999 - 12.7; 5,000 to 99,999 - 10.5

Suburban schools reported an average of 12.7 innovations adopted -- equal to urban schools in cities of 100,000-199,999 and less than that reported by schools in communities of 200,000-299,999 and cities of over 400,000 residents. In his study Cawelti grouped schools in all non-suburban communities from 5,000 to 399,999 residents. When combined in this manner, non-suburban schools averaged 12.4 innovations or .3 fewer than the average for suburban schools, although most larger urban schools reported higher adoption than those in suburban areas.

Small town and rural schools reported the fewest adoptions with an average of 8.1 and 7.7, respectively. They were the only schools in which fewer programs had been fully implemented than were being tried on a limited basis.

Highest abandonment was reported by schools in communities of 200,000-299,999 -- the category reporting highest adoption. Schools in cities of over 400,000 which ranked second in adoption also ranked second in abandonment with an average of 1.08. Suburban schools reported abandonment of .93 innovations per school. The fourth ranking group in abandonment was schools in communities of 300,000-399,999 with an average of 0.84. Those serving communities of 5,000-99,999 reported abandonment of an average of .76 per school while those in cities of 100,000-199,999 had abandoned an average of .71. Schools in small towns and rural areas which reported lowest adoption also reported lowest abandonment. Rural schools were last to adopt the innovations with 72.1 per cent reported adopted after 1970.

In general, adoption of innovations increased with the size of the community served, although there were exceptions in individual categories. Abandonment formed a less definite pattern in relation to size and type of community served. With the exception of schools in cities of over 400,000, suburban schools reported earliest adoption with 39.5 per cent adopted prior to 1970.

4. Is the type of school (public, private, parochial, government) a factor in adoption or abandonment?

Public schools reported both the lowest adoption and lowest abandonment of schools classified by source of support, with adoption averaging 10.2 per school and abandonment 0.72. Although non-public schools made up less than 10 per cent of the schools in the study, all exceeded public schools in adoption of innovations.

Government supported schools serving American dependents reported highest average adoption, 12.9, and abandonment, 1.05. In addition, these schools also reported latest adoption with 70.1 per cent of all adoptions occurring in 1970 or later.

Parochial or diocesan schools reported adoption of an average of 12.5 innovations and abandonment of 1.07. Private religious affiliated schools averaged adoption of 11.9 and abandonment of 1.21. Private, not religious affiliated schools reported highest adoption of 12.2 innovations per school and abandonment of 1.36. This group also reported earliest adoption with 37.5 per cent of innovations adopted prior to 1970. While reporting higher adoption than public schools, non-public schools also tended to experience greater difficulty in maintaining innovations.

5. Which of the general classifications of curriculum, organization, and technology were most commonly found in the schools in the survey population?

The findings of this study agree with that of Cawelti's in that curriculum innovations exceed technological and organization innovations in adoption. Curriculum practices accounted for 41.5 per cent innovations adopted while organizational and technological innovations had been adopted by 35.7 per cent and 22.8 per cent, respectively. Curriculum innovations averaged 4.3 per school; technological innovations, 2.4; and organizational innovations, 3.7.

The twenty innovations included in this study which were also included in Cawelti's study tended to be adopted more widely and abandoned to a lesser degree than was reported by Cawelti.

6. Which of the general classifications of curriculum, organization, and technology were most frequently abandoned?

Curricular innovations were the most often abandoned innovations with 44.6 per cent of all abandonment. However, it should be noted that more curricular innovations were tried by schools than were either technological or organizational innovations. Technological innovations accounted for 21.3 per cent of abandonment and organizational practices 34.2 per cent. An average of 0.34 curricular innovations per school were abandoned while technological and organizational innovations were abandoned an average of 0.16 and 0.26 per school.

7. To what extent are finance, personnel, administration, pupil outcomes, or patron acceptance factors in the durability of an innovation?

Finance. Among the five categories of reasons for abandonment of innovations, problems of finance ranked fourth, being reported as a factor in abandonment 953 times or 12.2 per cent of all reported reasons. One individual reason related to finance - benefits which did not justify costs involved -- was the second most often reported individual reason.

Reasons related to finance were reported most often in the abandonment of technological innovations. With the exception of HSGP Geography, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, and cultural enrichment programs, financial problems did not play a particularly important role in the abandonment of curriculum or organizational innovations.

Personnel. Reasons relating to school personnel amounted to 34.4 per cent of all reasons given, were reported most often as leading to abandonment. Lack of support for the program by teachers was the single most often reported individual reason in the study.

Reasons related to personnel were most often reported as the cause for abandonment of curricular innovations and figured prominently in all abandonment in this category with the exception of ethnic studies. Further, personnel problems were reported as the largest source of reasons for abandonment of television instruction, teaching machines, telephone amplification, simulation and gaming, team teaching, differentiated staffing, action learning.

Administration. Reasons related to administration ranked third among the five categories of abandonment reported accounting for 19.9 per cent of all reported reasons. Administrative reasons were among the leading causes of abandonment of organizational innovations including school-within-a-school plans, cultural enrichment programs, non-graded programs, and team teaching.

The most commonly reported individual reasons related to administration were unsuitable physical facilities, inadequate preliminary planning, and lack of clearly stated objectives.

Pupil Outcomes. Reasons related to pupil outcomes accounted for 26 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment and ranked second among the five categories. Pupil outcome problems were the major reason for abandonment of PSSC Physics, ethnic studies, flexible scheduling, college credit courses, non-graded programs, optional class attendance and early leaving plans. It will be noted that with the exception of the curricular innovations of PSSC Physics and ethnic studies, pupil outcome problems figured most prominently in the abandonment of organizational innovations.

The most often reported individual pupil outcome reasons were: lack of student acceptance which ranked third among all reasons; scheduling complications created by the program; pupil achievement problems; problems with pupil control; other varied pupil outcome reasons.

Patron Acceptance. Reasons related to patron acceptance accounted for only 7.5 per cent of all reasons for abandonment, and were not the major factor in abandonment of any of the thirty-three innovations. Schools reported little opposition from patrons except in the case of early leaving plans and the extended school year. Therefore, little or no opposition from outside sources was evident in abandonment.

8. Is the original impetus for the adoption of innovations a factor in abandonment?

Curricular innovations, which were both adopted and abandoned to the greatest extent, received their greatest impetus for adoption from teachers, students, and parents as a group. It should be noted, however, that teachers exerted a degree of influence far in excess of students and patrons. Organizational and technological innovations ranked second and third, respectively.

Administrators tended to influence the adoption of organizational innovations most with curricular and technological innovations following. They were credited with influencing the adoption of 40 per cent of the curricular innovations, later abandoned, compared with 49.4 per cent influenced by teachers, students, and parents.

Relatively little impetus for adoption of innovations, later abandoned, was registered by boards of education, state departments of education, the North Central Association, federal government agencies, or publishing and media companies, the results of educational research or other varied sources. Boards of education most often influenced the adoption of technological and organizational innovations. State departments of education, the North Central Association, federal government agencies, publishing and media companies and the results of educational research influenced curricular innovations more than technological or organizational practices.

Administrators as a group were reported as influencing 48.6 per cent of all categories of adoptions. Impetus from teachers, students, and parents amounted to 40.2 per cent, while outside agencies, boards of education, publishing and media companies, educational research results and other varied sources accounted for the remaining 11.2 per cent.

It should be noted that some of the innovations included in this study are newer than others. Such innovations as PSSC Physics, television instruction, data processing equipment, flexible scheduling, team teaching, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, etc. have been in use longer, and the opportunity for abandonment is greater than that for such practices as career education, mini-courses, HSGP Geography, differentiated staffing, action learning, etc.

Findings From Second Questionnaire

The majority of innovations adopted were designed for the general student body. Those developed to serve students selected on the basis of academic achievement accounted for

24.7 per cent of all responses concerning student population, while innovations provided students on the basis of career choices accounted for only 10.8 per cent.

In the main, innovations which had been fully implemented were being offered on an elective basis available to the general student body. The second most often reported use of the innovations in the study was that of limiting programs to a specialized group of students. Only 16.5 per cent were reported as required programs. By contrast, programs being tried on a limited basis were most often offered to selected students or were being tried on a pilot basis.

Over half of all programs abandoned had been in use from one to three years. Only 5.8 per cent of abandoned innovations had been in use less than one year and only 7.1 per cent had been abandoned if in use for more than five years.

The majority of innovations abandoned had been developed locally accounting for 55.1 per cent of abandoned innovations. Commercially developed programs accounted for 25.9 per cent of abandoned innovations while a combination of locally developed and commercially produced programs accounted for 18.9 per cent.

In most cases, responding schools reported no modification of innovations. In the instances where modifications were made, they generally consisted of combining some of the features of one program with another.

Conclusions

A critical examination of the data appears to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Rationale: Adoption of innovations in North Central Association schools was 9.7 or 29.4 per cent of the thirty-three included in the study. Cawelti had reported adoption of 6.1 or 22.6 per cent of the twenty-seven included in his study. Abandonment amounted to 0.76 or 2.3 per cent as compared with 1.7 or 6.3 per cent reported by Cawelti.

Conclusion: The increased extent of adoption of innovations in North Central Association schools and the decrease in abandonment indicate that the innovations in this study enjoy a greater degree of durability than those in schools in the Cawelti study.

2. Rationale: The most frequently abandoned innovations included PSSC Physics, flexible scheduling, programmed instruction, humanities courses, data processing equipment, television instruction, team teaching, teacher aides or paraprofessionals, IPS Physical Science, mini-courses and independent study programs. The least frequently abandoned innovations included simulation and gaming, action learning, learning packages, individual prescription of learning, telephone amplification, optional class attendance, college credit courses, computer assisted instruction, ethnic studies, early leaving plans, non-graded programs,

career education, teaching machines, cultural enrichment programs, and other project science and social studies programs.

Conclusion: In general, innovations suffering high abandonment are those which tend to be complex, expensive, and difficult to administer. Innovations tending to be more durable are generally simpler, less expensive, easier to administer, and in some cases, can be developed and implemented by individual teachers without affecting other ongoing programs of the school or the existing structural framework.

3. Rationale: Seventeen of the thirty-three innovations in the study had been adopted by more than 25 per cent of the responding schools. This is the arbitrary point selected by Cawelti to distinguish between practices considered innovative and those in such wide use as to no longer be considered innovations. Three of the seventeen innovations had been adopted, by a majority of schools making adoption, by 1969. The remaining fourteen innovations had been adopted by a majority of schools by 1974.

Only 5.2 per cent of the thirty-three innovations adopted by schools in this study had been implemented prior to 1965. The remaining innovations were adopted after 1965, and 64.8 per cent of all adoptions occurred between 1970 and 1974. Therefore, 94.8 per cent of all adoptions of innovations in the study had taken place within the past ten years, with 87.5 per cent of the seventeen most widely adopted practices implemented within this time period. Of the nine practices found in a majority of schools, 95.2 per cent had been adopted since 1965.

Conclusion: The amount of time required for the diffusion and adoption by North Central schools of a majority of the innovations in this study is significantly less than that reported necessary in previous studies of adoption.

4. Rationale: The adoption of innovations, in general, increased with increases in enrollment. Schools in large cities and suburban communities reported greater adoption of innovations than those located in smaller communities or rural areas. Schools in the largest urban communities exceeded suburban schools in adoption -- a departure from Cawelti's study. Though non-public schools reported greater adoption of innovations, these schools amounted to only 9.6 per cent of all schools in the study.

Conclusion: Innovations tend to be found in greater numbers in large public urban and suburban North Central schools.

5. Rationale: Adoption of innovations increased with larger per-pupil expenditures for instructional purposes. Schools with expenditures of over $1,500 per pupil reported the highest average number of adoptions of 14.5 per school.

Conclusion: There is a linear relationship between per-pupil expenditure and the average number of innovations adopted in North Central schools, tending to substantiate the findings of Mort.

6. Rationale: As the adoption of innovations increased in schools classified by enrollment and per-pupil expenditure, abandonment also tended to increase. With minor exception, the same relationship between adoption and abandonment existed in schools according to source of support, and size and type of community served. Though nonpublic schools led public schools in adoption, they tended to experience greater difficulty in maintaining innovations.

Conclusion: There is, in general, a direct relationship between the number of innovations adopted and the number abandoned.

7. Rationale: Curricular innovations accounted for 41.5 per cent of all adoptions; organizational innovations, 35.7 per cent; and technological innovations, 22.8 per cent. Abandonment was reported for curriculum, 44.6 per cent; organization, 34.2 per cent; and technology, 21.3 per cent.

Conclusion: There is a direct relationship between adoption of innovations by categories and abandonment.

8. Rationale: With the exception of PSSC Physics and to an extent, IPS Physical Science, packaged, commercially produced programs, including Harvard Physics, ESCP Physical Science, SSSP Physical Science, HSGP Geography, and SRSS Sociology, were abandoned by relatively few of the responding schools.

Conclusion: Innovations which are packaged and provide the teacher easy access to the needed materials appear to be rather durable.

9. Rationale: The reasons reported most often for abandonment were related to staff personnel. Lack of acceptance by teachers was the leading individual reason for abandonment. Problems related to pupil outcomes ranked second among the categories of reasons for abandonment. The two categories accounted for a total of 60.4 per cent of all stated reasons.

Conclusion: Abandonment of innovations in North Central schools is most often a result of staff personnel reasons and problems related to students.

10. Rationale: Reasons related to finance amounted to 12.2 per cent of all reported reasons for abandonment. Administrative reasons totaled 19.9 per cent, and reasons related to patron acceptance accounted for 7.5 per cent of all reported reasons.

Conclusion: Management difficulties, finance problems, and pressure from groups outside the school have relatively minor influence upon abandonment of innovations by North Central schools.

11. Rationale: Schools with enrollments of under 200 reported 72.7 per cent of adoptions of innovations occurring in 1970 or later. Other intervals and corresponding percentages were: 200-499, 70.7; 500-1,499, 66.0; 1,500-2,499, 59.2; and over 2,500, 54.2

Schools with per-pupil expenditures for instructional purposes of under $500 reported 69.2 per cent of adoptions occurring in 1970 or later. Other intervals and their corresponding percentages were: $500-799, 68.1; $800-1,500, 63.3; over $1,500, 56.8

Conclusion: There is a linear relationship between size of enrollment and per-pupil expenditure, and the date of adoption of innovations. The larger the enrollment and the higher the per-pupil expenditure, the earlier North Central Association schools adopted innovations.

12. Rationale: A total of 54 per cent of innovations adopted were designed for the general student population with 24.7 per cent developed to serve the academically talented and 10.8 per cent designed for students on the basis of their career choices.

Conclusion: Innovations adopted by North Central schools tend to be designed for the general student population rather than the special interests of selected students.

13. Rationale: The majority of innovations abandoned had been in use from one to three years. Only 24.1 per cent of those abandoned had been in use for one year or less and only 25.7 per cent had been abandoned after three years.

Conclusion: A range of one to three years is the critical period in the existence of an innovation. Should the practice be in use beyond three years, the chances of it being retained are measurably improved.

Implications

The following implications are presented as a result of the conclusions of the study.

1. The greater durability of innovations in North Central schools when compared to the schools in the Cawelti study implies that, while a great deal of publicity is often attendant to the introduction of new practices, a reasonable amount of time is needed for stability to develop and the true impact of innovations to be assessed.

An additional implication is that some schools may tend to be somewhat cautious about early adoption preferring instead to allow others to initiate new practices and then following if the practices continue to show promise.

2. The relatively higher abandonment of more complex or expensive innovations implies that there is a need for a definite strategy for change, especially when alterations in the existing structure are anticipated.

The relatively lower abandonment of simpler teacher-initiated innovations implies that one of the conditions for durable change may be to develop strategies encouraging decentralized, less sophisticated practices which can be directed by the teacher, rather than requiring an inordinate amount of administrative attention.

3. The greater adoption of innovations by larger, better financed schools implies that new practices require adequate personnel and financing to implement and that these conditions should be carefully considered when attempting adoption.

4. The conclusion that reasons related to staff and student personnel are most often the cause of abandonment of

innovations implies the need for emphasis in schools of educational administration on the training of administrators in areas of interpersonal relationships and leadership.

5. The limited influence of boards of education, regulatory agencies and patrons on abandonment implies that while such groups must not be ignored, their attitudes toward innovations are generally favorable and supportive.

6. The limited impact of educational research upon adoption of innovations underscores the need for better ways to communicate the results of research to the practitioner.

7. The relative success of packaged, commercially produced programs which provide easily accessible materials and equipment implies that simplifying the mechanics of an innovation may be important to its success.

8. The influence of administrators upon adoption of innovations later abandoned implies the need for ever increased emphasis upon extensive training and performance in instructional leadership -- an area of administrative responsibility often neglected.

Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of questions beyond the scope of this study, the following studies are recommended:

1. An investigation of the invention phase of the innovative process should be undertaken. From the early studies by Mort to the present, little or no effort has been

made to determine the more effective approaches to the initial development of an innovation. Practically all studies have dealt with the introduction and diffusion of new practices.

2. An investigation of the change strategies employed by administrators of highly innovative schools is recommended. While the object should not be to develop a taxonomy of tasks, some answers to, as Cawelti states, the present "haphazard way" changes are introduced in schools should be sought. There must be some alternative to that which Mort described as "fits and starts" and the constant "reinventing of the wheel" now present, which reduces curriculum and instructional development to the status of a cottage industry. The quality of teaching practice might improve if judgments about curriculum and instruction were based on extensive research and development rather than destined to be made again and again in isolation by individual teachers or administrators.

3. This study dealt only with reasons for abandonment of innovations after trial. A further investigation of reasons for adoption of innovations is recommended.

4. An investigation conducted through in-depth case studies of schools with conspicuous records of success in adoption and retention of innovations, in addition to schools which experienced a high degree of difficulty in maintaining innovative practices after adoption, could be of considerable value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

__________. *The New Testament in Modern English.* Translated by J.B. Phillips. New York: The McMillian Company, 1962.

Applebaum, Richard F. *Theories of Social Change.* Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Bemis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin. *The Planning of Change.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1969.

Brickell, Henry M. *Organizing New York State for Educational Change.* Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1961.

Burnham, Brian, ed. *New Designs for Learning.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Carlson, Richard O. *Adoption of Educational Innovations.* Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

Carlson, Richard O. and others. *Change Processes in the Public Schools.* Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

Chin, Robert. "Some Ideas on Changing" in Richard I. Miller (ed.), *Perspectives on Educational Change.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

DeCarlo, Julia E. and Constant A. Madon. *Innovations in Education for the Seventies.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Dykes, Archie R. "The Emergent Role of Administration and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships" in Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (eds.), *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, University of Arkansas and University Council of Educational Administration, 1966.

Eichholz, Gerhard and Everett M. Rogers. "Resistance to the Adoption of Audio-Visual Aids by Elementary School Teachers" in Matthew Miles (ed.), *Innovation in Education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Goldberg, Miriam L. "Evaluation of Innovations" in Marcella K. Lawler (ed.), *Strategies for Planned Curricular Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Grace, A.G. and G.A. Moe. *State Aid and School Costs*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations" in Matthew B. Miles (ed.), *Innovation in Education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Harris, Seymour E. (ed.). *Challenge and Change in American Education*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965.

Hillison, Maurie and Ronald T. Hyman. *Change and Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Organization*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1971. Second Edition.

Huberman, A.M. *Understanding Change in Education: An Introduction*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 1973.

Lawler, Marcella R. *Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970.

Lewis, Sinclair. *Main Street*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, 1920.

Likert, Rensis. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Lionberger, Herbert F. "Strategy Implications for Planned Curricular Changes in Education: Inferences From Diffusion Research" in Marcella K. Lawler (ed.), *Strategies for Planned Curricular Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Lippit, Ronald, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westly. *The Dynamics of Planned Change*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1958.

Mackenzie, Gordon N. "Why a Strategy for Planned Curricular Innovation?" in Marcella K. Lawler (ed.), Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Mallery, David. New Approaches to Education. Boston, Massachusetts: National Council of Independent Schools, 1961.

Mann, Floyd C. and Franklin W. Neff. Managing Major Change in Organizations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, 1961.

Miles, Matthew B. "Planned Change and Organizational Health" in Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1964.

Miles, Matthew B. (ed.). Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Miles, Matthew B. "Educational Innovation: Some Generalizations" in Media and Educational Innovation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1964.

Miller, Richard I. (ed.). Perspectives on Educational Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Mort, Paul R. "Educational Adaptability" in Donald H. Ross (ed.)., Administration for Adaptability. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1958.

Mort, Paul R. and Francis G. Cornell. American Schools in Transition. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1970.

Parsons, Talcott and Neil J. Smelser. The Social System. New York: Free Press, 1951.

Pellegrin, Ronald J. "The Place of Research in Planned Change" in Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1965.

Reichard, Sandford. Change and the Teacher. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Incorporated, 1969.

Rogers, Everett M. and F. Floyd Shcemaker. Communication of Innovation. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Russell, James E. Change and Challenge in American Education. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1965.

Schneider, Kenneth R. Destiny of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1968.

Shedd, Mark R. "Yesterday's Curriculum/Today's World: Time to Reinvent the Wheel" in National Social Studies Education Yearbook, Washington, D.C.: National Social Studies Education Association, 1971.

Street, David (ed.). Innovation in Mass Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Thomas, R. Murray, Lester B. Sands, and Dale L. Brubaker. Strategies for Curriculum Change. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1968.

Ward, Ted W. and John E. Ivey, Jr. "Improvement of Educational Practice" in Robert L. Ebel (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Toronto: The MacMillian Company, 1969. Fourth Edition.

Watson, Goodwin. "Resistance to Change" in Warren G. Bemis and others (ed.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Incorporated, 1961. Second Edition.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

__________. Innovative Education Practices. National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, October, 1973.

Allen, James E. "Strengthening Educational Research and Development". Remarks given at the Conference on American Education, Washington, D.C.: National Network of Regional Education Laboratories, July, 1969.

Pellegrin, Roland J. "An Analysis of Sources and Processes of Innovation in Education". A paper presented to the Conference on Educational Change, Allerton Park, Illinois, February 28, 1966.

Swanson, Austin D. "The Cost Quality Relationship", in The Challenge of Change in School Finance. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on School Finance. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1967.

C. PERIODICALS

__________. "Innovation Study of Nation's High Schools Reveals Important Changes in Recent Years," North Central Association Today, Vol. XI (March, 1967).

__________. "The Innovation Rate is Speeding Up, " Secondary Curriculum Letter, Vol. 9, No. 7 (March, 1970).

Armstrong, Robert. "Do NCA Accreditation Standards Inhibit Innovation?" North Central Association Quarterly, (Fall, 1972).

Cass, James M. "Where the Action Is," Saturday Review, (October, 15, 1966).

Cawelti, Gordon. "Innovative Practices in High Schools: Who Does What--and Why--and How?" Nation's Schools, LXXIX (April, 1967).

Cole, H.P. "Exemplary Curricula as Vehicles for Facilitating Creativity", Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 4 (Spring, 1971).

Frymer, Jack R. "Teachers: Not Will, But Can They Change?" Strategies for Educational Change Newsletter, II (November, 1968).

Glines, Don. "Why Innovative Schools Don't Remain Innovative?" NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 370 (February, 1973).

Hansen, J. Merrell. "Instructional Obsolescence: How Not to Keep Up with the Joneses!" NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 370 (February, 1973).

Havinghurst, Robert J. "Educational Leadership for the Seventies", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 7 (March, 1972).

Hickey, M.E. "Evaluation in Alternative Education", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 374 (September, 1973).

Hinkemeyer, Michael T. and Michael Longenbach. "The 'Turn-Off' How to Impede Change", The Clearing House, Vol. 47, No. 4 (December, 1972).

Norman, Douglas and Ralph Balyeat. "Whither ESEA III?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 3 (November, 1973).

Orlosky, Donald and B. Othanel Smith. "Educational Change: Its Origins and Characteristics," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. VII, No. 7 (March, 1972).

Rutherford, F.J. "Preparing Teachers for Curriculum Reform", Science Education, Vol. 55 (October, 1971).

Shane, Harold G. "The Drop-Out Problem in Educational Innovation", Educational Leadership, Vol. 30, No. 6 (March, 1973).

Sizer, Theodore R. "Three Major Frustrations: Ruminations of a Retiring Dean", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 10 (June, 1972).

Snow, C.P. "Miasma, Darkness and Torpidity", New Statesman (1961).

Stanavage, John. "Trends in N.C.A. Schools", The North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Summer, 1973).

Stanavage, John. "Trends in N.C.A. Schools", The North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Summer, 1974).

Sulkin, Sidney. "The Challenge Summarized", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 311 (September, 1966).

Sybouts, Ward. "Change by Objectives", The Clearing House, Vol. 48, No. 2 (October, 1973).

Thelen, Herbert A. "New Practices on the Firing Line", Administrator's Notebook, XII, No. 5 (January, 1964).

Trump, J. Lloyd and W. Georgiadees. "Which Elements of School Programs are Easier to Change and Which are Most Difficult, and Why?: Model School Project", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 55 (May, 1971).

Willower, Donald J. "Barriers to Change in Educational Organizations", Theory Into Practice (December, 1963).

D. NEWSPAPERS

________. "Innovations No Guide to Quality Education", *Daily American Republic*, Vol. 97, No. 264 (December 1, 1972).

________. "No Blueprints for Innovation", *London Times Educational Supplement*, No. 3042 (September 14, 1973).

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Addis, Winston Clark. "An Analysis of the Perceptions of Principals of High and Low Innovative Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968.

Bigelow, M.A. "Discovery and Diffusion in Pioneer Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.

Griffiths, Daniel. "What Is Theory?" Recorded lecture.

Hardenbrook, Robert F. "Identification of Processes of Innovation in Selected Schools in Santa Barbara County." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967.

Hawkins, Wilber D. "Some Factors Which Contribute to Successful Educational Innovation." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.

Jensen, Leroy. "Characteristics of Superintendents in Innovating and Non-Innovating School Systems and Interaction with the Iowa Department of Public Instruction." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Knedlik, Stanley M. "The Effect of Administrative Succession Patterns Upon Educational Innovation." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967.

Marsh, Paul E. "The Physical Science Study Committee: A Case History of Nationwide Curriculum Development." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1963.

Overly, Donald E. "Comparative Analysis of North Central Accredited Indiana Secondary Schools in Relation to Educational Innovations." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968.

Rajpal, Puran Lal. "A Study of the Relationship Between Expenditure and Quality Characteristics of Education in Iowa Public Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

APPENDIX A

STATUS OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES IN NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECONDARY SCHOOLS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please complete the information requested describing your school under Part A of the questionnaire. Then read carefully the definitions provided for the various innovations or practices on which we are seeking information. After reading the definitions please complete Parts B and C.

EXAMPLE: Part B

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis

23. Team
Teaching----✓---------0---------0-----0-----0-------0---------0-----

A course under the direction of two or more faculty members, all of whom participate directly in planning and meeting the class sessions.

If practice has been abandoned, as is the example, you would then turn to Part C and mark the reason(s) for abandonment of the innovation as follows:

EXAMPLE: Part C

Reasons for abandoning the innovative program are checked below: Team Teaching
NAME OF PROGRAM CHECKED IN PART B

I. Reasons Related to Financing the Program
   ___Federal funds could not be secured.
   ✓Benefits of the program did not justify the costs.

II. Reasons Related to Personnel
   ✓Necessary leadership was not available.
   ___Leadership personnel changed.

PART A - PLACE AN "X" IN THE BOX OPPOSITE THE CATEGORY BEST DESCRIBING YOUR SCHOOL:

1. What is your current enrollment:
   ___Fewer than 200
   ___200-499
   ___500-1499
   ___1500-2499
   ___Over 2500

2. What is the average annual per-pupil expenditure for instructional purposes:
   ___Less than $500
   ___500-799
   ___800-1500
   ___Over 1500

3. Which of the following best describes the kind of school this is:
   ___Public
   ___Parochial or diocesan
   ___Private, not religious affiliated
   ___Government, other

4. A majority of your students live in which kind of area:
   ___City of over 400,000 residents
   ___Community of 300,000-399,999 (not suburban)
   ___Community of 200,000-299,999 (not suburban)
   ___Community of 100,000-199,999 (not suburban)
   ___Community of 5,000-99,999 (not suburban)
   ___Suburban within urban fringe of central city
   ___Small town of under 5,000
   ___Rural area

PART B - PLEASE READ DEFINITIONS FOLLOWING EACH INNOVATION LISTED BELOW:

1. Please remember that if the practice has been tried and ABANDONED an X should be placed in the first box. The REASON(S) for abandoning the innovation are to be checked by turning to PART C.

2. If the innovation has NEVER been adopted by your school please place an X in the second box.

3. If the innovation has ever been used, either presently or at some time in the past, in your school, please place an X in the box which to the best of your recollection, indicates WHEN it was adopted.

4. If the innovation is PRESENTLY in use please indicate by checking the appropriate box whether it is being FULLY IMPLEMENTED or being tried on a LIMITED BASIS.

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis
CURRICULUM							
1. PSSC Physics Physical Science Study Committee materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. Harvard Physics Harvard University Physics Project materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. ESCP Physical Sci Earth Science Curriculum Project materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. SSSP Physical Sci Secondary School Science Project (Princeton) physical science course using Time, Space, Matter.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. IPS Physical Sci Introductory Physical Science materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Humanities Course Elective or required course given for at least a semester's credit which combines instruction in art, music, literature, and philosophy.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. Career Education An overall plan unifying all phases of the curriculum in occupation awareness or preparation.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. Independent Study Programs Programs allowing students a segment of the school day free from regular classes to pursue in-depth study of a subject of the students own choosing.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○

*If abandoned, please check reasons in PART C.

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis
9. Mini-Courses An elective course taught and completed in 60 class hours or less.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. Learning Packages Individualization of the pace of learning by allowing students to work through packaged short units of instruction at their own rate.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. HSGP Geography High School Geography Project materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. IPI Individually Prescribed Instruction, either commercially produced programs or programs developed by the school district or some related educational institution.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. SRSS Sociology Sociological Resources for the Social Studies materials.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. Ethnic Studies An individual course or broad program of study of the history, heritage and culture of one or more ethnic groups.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
TECHNOLOGY							
15. Television Instruction The regular use of open or closed circuit television as a means of teaching courses for credit. (Includes cable television)	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○
16. Programmed Instruction A course designed for independent use in which students regularly use programmed materials (without a machine) so organized as to proceed in small steps, respond to information, and be informed immediately whether or not the response is correct.	○*	○	○	○	○	○	○

*If abandoned, please check reasons in PART C.

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis

17. Teaching
Machines-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Mechanical devices which present educational programs designed to teach a student through controlled communication--used regularly in the classroom instruction.

18. Telephone
Amplification---------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

One or more classes periodically arranges to amplify telephone conversations dealing with information being studied in class.

19. Simulation
or Gaming----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

The use of a device to create realistic political, social, or economic situations in class for helping students to become involved in decision-making.

20. Data
Processing
Equipment----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Electronic accounting machines and computers are used for class scheduling, reporting marks, attendance accounting, etc.

21. Computer
Assisted
Instruction--0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

One or more classes regularly uses a computer or computer terminal as an integral part of instruction.

ORGANIZATION

22. Flexible
Scheduling---0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

The school operates on a variable schedule which starts with modules of less than 40 minutes in length and organizes the day into various combinations of these modules according to the different learning environments required.

23. Team
Teaching-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

A course under the direction of two or more faculty members, all of whom participate directly in planning and meeting the class sessions.

*If abandoned, please check reasons in PART C.

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis

24. College Credit Courses------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

High school students take Advance Placement courses and examinations, or a similar kind of arrangement, whereby credit is given for college level courses.

25. Non-Graded Programs-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Student may pursue any course in which he is interested, and has the ability to achieve, without regard to grade level or sequence; subjects are not divided into semesters and students progress on individual basis.

26. Teacher Aides Paraprofessionals------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

The use of degree or non-degree persons for assisting teachers in essentially non-teaching duties such as evaluating student compositions, supervising halls, or checking papers.

27. Differentiated Staffing-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Assigning teachers to differing levels of responsibility and classification utilizing special abilities and allowing for differences in compensation.

28. School-Within-A-School-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

An organizational design whereby a large secondary school is divided into smaller schools each having its own administration, guidance staff, building space, and students.

29. Cultural Enrichment Program------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0------

A regular program attempting to expose students to elements of society outside the school such as concerts, lectures, museums. This is intended as a regular program for given students, not just occasional field trips.

*If abandoned, please check reasons in PART C.

Innovation or Practice	Have tried but abandoned	No, practice was never used	If ever used, check year begun:			Yes, presently in use	
			Before 1965	65-69	70-74	Fully implemented and operating	Being tried on limited basis

30. Optional Class Attendance-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

An attempt to encourage independent study by permitting students to have a choice as to whether or not they will attend class regularly.

31. Extended School Year---------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

The total number of days in the school year (exclusive of summer sessions) is in the area of 200 days or more, or at least approximately two weeks in excess of what may be legally required.

32. Action Learning-----0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Provision for placing students in the real world with adults on a paid or nonpaid basis in social service agencies, business, or industry.

33. Early Leaving Plan---------0*----------0---------0-----0----0-------0---------0-----

Provision for students to complete graduation requirements and leave school in less than thirty-six months of attendance between grades 9 and 12.

*FOR ALL INNOVATIONS OR PRACTICES REPORTED ABANDONED,
PLEASE TURN TO PART C AND MARK REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT

PART C REASONS FOR ABANDONMENT OF INNOVATION

Reasons for abandoning the innovative ______________________________
program checked (✓) below: NAME OF PROGRAM CHECKED IN PART B

I. Reasons Related to Financing the Program
1. ___Benefits of the program did not justify the costs.
2. ___Federal funds could not be secured.
3. ___Federal funds were discontinued.
4. ___Local funding was discontinued.
5. ___Other FINANCIAL reasons:______________________________

II. Reasons Related to Personnel
1. ___Necessary leadership was not available.
2. ___Leadership personnel responsible for the innovation changed.
3. ___Central office support for the innovation was not forthcoming.
4. ___Building administrators did not support the innovation.
5. ___Competent specialists and support personnel were not available.
6. ___Teachers did not support the program.
7. ___Teachers' organizations opposed the change.
8. ___Teachers were not adequately trained.
9. ___In-service training was not provided or was inadequate.
10. ___Other PERSONNEL reasons:______________________________

III. Reasons Related to Administration
1. ___Preliminary planning was not adequate.
2. ___Objectives were not clearly stated.
3. ___Administrative detail required was too cumbersome to be justified.
4. ___Public relations activities were not adequate.
5. ___Administrator/Staff relationships were not satisfactory.
6. ___Physical facilities were not suitable.
7. ___Adequate materials and equipment were not provided.
8. ___Project practices were discouraged by State Department of Education.
9. ___Project practices violated regulations of accrediting agencies.
10. ___Adequate support services (computer, statistical, etc.) were not available.
11. ___Other ADMINISTRATIVE reasons:__________________________

IV. Reasons Related to Pupil Outcomes
1. ___Students did not accept the new program.
2. ___Program was detrimental to pupil achievement.
3. ___Program created scheduling complications.
4. ___Program adversely affected pupil control.
5. ___Program adversely affected pupil morale.
6. ___Program was detrimental to other ongoing programs.
7. ___Program complicated high school/college transition for pupils.
8. ___Other PUPIL reasons:________________________________

V. Reasons Related to Acceptance by Patrons
1. ___The board of education did not support the program.
2. ___Program was not accepted by parents.
3. ___Program was misunderstood by patrons.
4. ___Program became controversial.
5. ___Community opposed program expenditures.
6. ___Other PATRON ACCEPTANCE reasons: ____________________________

VI. The original impetus for the ADOPTION of this program came from: (check (✓) as many as needed)
1. ___Building Principal
2. ___Other Building Administrators
3. ___Superintendent
4. ___Director of Curriculum and/or Instruction
5. ___Teachers
6. ___Students
7. ___Parents
8. ___Board of Education
9. ___State Department of Education
10. ___Regional Accrediting Association
11. ___Federal Government Agencies
12. ___Publishing and Media companies
13. ___Results of Educational Research
14. ___Other ____

APPENDIX B

____________ School Number

Part A

STATUS OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES IN NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The following innovative practices were indicated as being IN USE in your school. Would you please provide the requested information about each innovation by placing a check (✓) in the blank which best answers the questions in the boxes below about each innovation.

	Which of the following best describes the student population for which the innovation was designed?	If fully implemented which of the following best describes the degree of implementation?	If being tried on a limited basis which of the following best describes the degree of implementation?
1. ______ ______	__1. A few students selected on the basis of academic achievement __2. The general student body __3. A few students selected on the basis of career choices __4. Other: ____________ ____________	__1. Serves a specialized group of students __2. Used in an elective course __3. Used in program required of all students __4. Offered each year __5. Offered on alternate years __6. Other: __________ __________	__1. Tried on a pilot basis of one or two sections __2. Enrollment is offered to only a few selected students __3. Being offered on a temporary basis __4. Other: __________ __________
2. ______ ______	__1. A few students selected on the basis of academic achievement __2. The general student body __3. A few students selected on the basis of career choices __4. Other: ____________ ____________	__1. Serves a specialized group of students __2. Used on an elective course __3. Used in program required of all students __4. Offered each year __5. Offered on alternate years __6. Other: __________ __________	__1. Tried on a pilot basis of one or two sections __2. Enrollment is offered to only a few selected students __3. Being offered on a temporary basis __4. Other: __________ __________

Part B

The following innovations were reported as having been tried and ABANDONED by your school. Would you please provide the requested information about each innovation listed by placing a check (✓) in the blank before the choice which best answers the questions about each innovation.

	How long was the innovation in use before being abandoned?	From what source was the innovation developed?	What, if any, modifications of the innovation were made by your school?
1.______	__1. Less than one year	__1. Locally developed	__None
______	__2. One year	__2. Commerically produced	__The following modifications were made (describe):
	__3. 1-3 years	__3. Combination of #1 and #2 above	______
	__4. 3-5 years		______
	__5. More than 5 years		______
2.______	__1. Less than one year	__1. Locally developed	__ None
______	__2. One year	__2. Commerically produced	__ The following modifications were made (describe):
	__3. 1-3 years	__3. Combination of #1 and #2 above	______
	__4. 3-5 years		______
	__5. More than 5 years		______
3.______	__1. Less than one year	__1. Locally developed	__ None
______	__2. One year	__2. Commerically produced	__ The following modifications were made (describe):
	__3. 1-3 years	__3. Combination of #1 and #2 above	______
	__4. 3-5 years		______
	__5. More than 5 years		______
4.______	__1. Less than one year	__1. Locally developed	__ None
______	__2. One year	__2. Commerically produced	__ The following modifications were made (describe):
	__3. 1-3 years	__3. Combination of #1 and #2 above	______
	__4. 3-5 years		______
	__5. More than 5 years		______
5.______	__1. Less than one year	__1. Locally developed	__ None
______	__2. One year	__2. Commerically produced	__ The following modifications were made (describe):
	__3. 1-3 years	__3. Combination of #1 and #2 above	______
	__4. 3-5 years		______
	__5. More than 5 years		______

APPENDIX C

TABLE XCIII

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS ADOPTED AND/OR ABANDONED BY RESPONDING SCHOOLS BY STATE

State	N	Adopted	Abandoned
Unidentified	13	9.3	0.9
Arizona	89	10.7	0.9
Arkansas	118	6.1	0.4
Colorado	126	11.5	0.7
Illinois	482	10.5	0.8
Indiana	254	8.1	0.7
Iowa	172	10.4	0.6
Kansas	155	8.6	0.6
Michigan	304	10.5	0.9
Minnesota	128	12.9	0.8
Missouri	164	10.2	1.0
Nebraska	127	8.8	0.6
New Mexico	51	10.9	0.9
North Dakota	36	9.3	0.7
Ohio	446	9.4	0.8
Oklahoma	141	6.5	0.6
South Dakota	59	8.4	0.8
West Virginia	104	[illegible].2	0.6
Wisconsin	230	11.6	0.8
Wyoming	28	10.5	0.8
Overseas Dependents Schools	44	12.9	1.1
Total	3,271		
Mean		9.7	0.76

TABLE XCIV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY STATE REPORTING ADOPTION OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS

		PSSC Physics		Harvard Physics		ESCP Physical Science	
State	n	f	%	f	%	f	%
Unidentified	13	3	27.3	2	18.2	3	27.3
Arizona	89	24	27.0	22	24.7	27	30.3
Arkansas	119	11	9.3	9	7.6	9	7.6
Colorado	126	65	51.6	27	21.4	39	31.0
Illinois	483	197	40.9	67	13.9	97	20.1
Indiana	245	59	23.2	34	13.4	28	11.0
Iowa	173	70	40.7	67	39.0	37	21.5
Kansas	156	52	33.5	21	13.5	28	18.1
Michigan	305	121	39.8	70	23.0	49	16.1
Minnesota	129	74	57.8	57	44.5	23	18.0
Missouri	164	79	48.2	37	22.6	26	15.9
Nebraska	127	38	29.9	21	16.5	23	18.1
New Mexico	51	22	43.1	3	5.9	8	15.7
North Dakota	36	12	33.3	7	19.4	8	22.2
Ohio	448	158	35.4	66	14.8	60	13.5
Oklahoma	141	29	20.6	11	7.8	16	11.3
South Dakota	59	27	45.8	8	13.6	6	10.2
West Virginia	104	25	24.0	11	10.6	12	11.5
Wisconsin	231	115	50.0	67	29.1	34	14.8
Wyoming	28	10	35.7	5	17.9	6	21.4
Dependent's Schools	44	37	80.4	11	23.9	4	8.7
Total	3271	1228	37.5	623	19.0	543	16.6

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

SSSP Physical Science		IPS Physical Science		Humanities Courses		Career Education	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	4	36.4	5	45.5	6	54.5
2	2.2	25	28.1	36	40.4	74	83.1
6	5.1	26	22.0	37	31.4	62	52.5
3	2.4	54	42.9	52	41.3	67	53.2
30	6.2	189	39.2	222	46.1	276	57.3
7	2.8	55	21.7	60	23.6	94	37.0
10	5.8	50	29.1	71	41.3	104	60.5
7	4.5	28	18.1	52	33.5	85	54.8
11	3.6	111	36.5	147	48.4	189	62.2
8	6.3	52	40.6	72	56.3	72	56.3
10	6.1	57	34.8	83	50.6	65	39.6
5	3.9	48	37.8	29	22.8	61	48.0
2	3.9	12	23.5	33	64.7	42	82.4
3	8.3	6	16.7	8	22.2	27	75.0
17	3.8	103	23.1	170	38.1	164	36.8
7	5.0	30	21.3	46	32.6	61	43.3
2	3.4	18	30.5	17	28.8	23	39.0
6	5.8	22	21.2	31	29.8	52	50.0
6	2.6	103	44.8	88	38.3	116	50.4
1	3.6	10	35.7	11	39.3	20	71.4
1	2.2	42	91.3	29	63.0	36	78.3
144	4.4	1045	31.9	1299	39.7	1696	51.8

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

Independent Study Programs		Mini-Courses		Learning Packages		HSGP Geography	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
8	72.7	4	36.4	3	27.3	2	18.2
53	59.6	34	38.2	43	48.3	6	6.7
27	22.9	23	19.5	25	21.2	9	7.6
100	79.4	78	61.9	72	57.1	20	15.9
328	68.0	224	46.5	229	47.5	104	21.6
146	57.5	128	50.4	94	37.0	40	15.7
118	68.6	95	55.2	118	68.6	45	26.2
124	80.0	112	72.3	57	36.8	19	12.3
235	77.3	142	46.7	110	36.2	32	10.5
110	85.9	65	50.8	70	54.7	33	25.8
96	58.5	81	49.4	81	49.4	25	15.2
54	42.5	74	58.3	88	69.3	26	20.5
30	58.8	32	62.7	18	35.3	10	19.6
17	47.2	26	72.2	12	33.3	10	27.8
273	61.2	294	65.9	149	33.4	108	24.2
47	33.3	41	29.1	35	24.8	10	7.1
32	54.2	29	49.2	33	55.9	15	25.4
44	42.3	46	44.2	30	28.8	11	10.6
172	74.8	110	47.8	139	60.4	66	28.7
21	75.0	10	35.7	15	53.6	4	14.3
43	93.5	31	67.4	19	41.3	5	10.9
2078	63.5	1679	51.3	1440	44.0	600	18.3

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

IPI		SRSS Sociology		Ethnic Studies		Television Instruction	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
7	63.6	2	18.2	0	0.0	7	63.6
69	77.5	40	44.9	12	13.5	73	82.0
42	35.6	24	20.3	11	9.3	66	55.9
100	79.4	53	42.1	34	27.0	95	75.4
339	70.3	272	56.4	63	13.1	278	57.7
173	68.1	68	26.8	45	17.7	162	63.8
120	69.8	57	33.1	29	16.9	110	64.0
82	52.9	53	34.2	26	16.8	80	51.6
201	66.1	158	52.0	75	24.7	176	57.9
95	74.2	61	47.7	38	29.7	97	75.8
108	65.9	75	45.7	27	16.5	83	50.6
63	49.6	49	38.6	24	18.9	89	70.1
35	68.6	28	54.9	9	17.6	32	62.7
16	44.4	12	33.3	7	19.4	20	55.6
284	63.7	206	46.2	94	21.1	250	56.1
63	44.7	22	15.6	19	13.5	91	64.5
36	61.0	9	15.3	15	25.4	42	71.2
50	48.1	53	51.0	22	21.2	60	57.7
183	79.6	110	47.8	42	18.3	159	69.1
19	67.9	17	60.7	9	32.1	22	78.6
27	58.7	19	41.3	20	43.5	27	58.7
2112	64.6	1388	42.4	621	79.0	2019	61.7

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

Programmed Instruction		Teaching Machines		Telephone Amplification		Simulation or Gaming	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
3	27.3	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0.0
7	7.9	4	4.5	23	25.8	4	4.5
10	8.5	2	1.7	32	27.1	3	2.5
21	16.7	11	8.7	32	25.4	12	9.5
71	14.7	32	6.6	124	25.7	45	9.3
24	9.4	10	3.9	40	15.7	22	8.7
14	8.1	7	4.1	27	15.7	20	11.6
18	11.6	6	3.9	37	23.9	14	9.0
24	7.9	23	7.6	59	19.4	22	7.2
16	12.5	14	10.9	28	21.9	10	7.8
24	14.6	14	8.5	49	29.9	11	6.7
9	7.1	4	3.1	18	14.2	8	6.3
14	27.5	1	2.0	19	37.3	5	9.8
6	16.7	3	8.3	9	25.0	1	2.8
59	13.2	25	5.6	98	22.0	31	7.0
24	17.0	3	2.1	26	18.4	5	3.5
5	8.5	2	3.4	13	22.0	4	6.8
16	15.4	4	3.8	28	26.9	4	3.8
29	12.6	10	4.3	45	19.6	28	12.2
1	3.6	1	3.6	6	21.4	2	7.1
4	8.7	0	0.0	20	43.5	9	19.6
399	12.2	177	5.4	734	22.4	260	7.9

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

Data Processing Equipment		Computer Assisted Instruction		Flexible Scheduling		Team Teaching	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	7	63.6	2	18.2	2	18.2
3	3.4	61	68.5	50	56.2	12	13.5
0	0.0	38	32.2	41	34.7	6	5.1
4	3.2	67	53.2	69	54.8	13	10.3
8	1.7	303	62.9	297	61.6	53	11.0
3	1.2	121	47.6	144	56.7	8	3.1
2	1.2	102	59.3	112	65.1	14	8.1
1	0.6	77	49.7	84	54.2	5	3.2
10	3.3	197	64.8	156	51.3	27	8.9
3	2.3	82	64.1	72	56.3	10	7.8
2	1.2	94	57.3	114	69.5	18	11.0
3	2.4	71	55.9	65	51.2	16	12.6
0	0.0	32	62.7	33	64.7	1	2.0
0	0.0	25	69.4	16	44.4	4	11.1
9	2.0	225	50.4	296	66.4	23	5.2
3	2.1	70	49.[illegible]	47	33.3	9	6.4
1	1.7	25	42.4	30	50.8	0	0.0
22	21.2	60	57.7	59	56.7	6	5.8
3	1.3	152	66.1	165	71.7	12	5.2
1	3.6	19	67.9	19	67.9	5	17.9
1	2.2	36	78.3	40	87.0	6	13.0
79	2.4	1864	57.0	1911	58.4	250	7.6

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

College Credit Courses f	College Credit Courses %	Non-Graded Programs f	Non-Graded Programs %	Teacher Aides Paraprofessionals f	Teacher Aides Paraprofessionals %
3	27.3	2	18.2	2	18.2
16	18.0	3	3.4	38	42.7
21	17.8	6	5.1	23	19.5
18	14.3	15	11.9	68	54.0
81	16.8	52	10.8	229	47.5
31	12.2	18	7.1	66	26.0
22	12.8	11	6.4	70	40.7
24	15.5	14	9.0	69	44.5
49	16.1	20	6.6	159	52.3
23	18.0	14	10.9	86	67.2
25	15.2	15	9.1	75	45.7
20	15.7	6	4.7	32	25.2
6	11.8	7	13.7	33	64.7
6	16.7	4	11.1	12	33.3
44	9.9	28	6.3	158	35.4
15	10.6	18	12.8	30	21.3
5	8.5	6	10.2	23	39.0
10	9.6	12	11.5	27	26.0
48	20.9	21	9.1	115	50.0
4	14.3	5	17.9	10	35.7
6	13.0	1	2.2	34	73.9
477	14.6	278	8.5	1359	41.5

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

Differentiated Staffing		School-Within-A-School		Cultural Enrichment Programs		Optional Class Attendance	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	9.1	6	54.5	4	36.4	1	9.1
21	23.6	39	43.8	30	33.7	17	19.1
16	13.6	39	33.1	26	22.0	9	7.6
30	23.8	47	37.3	33	26.2	16	12.7
94	19.5	182	37.8	101	21.0	48	10.0
68	26.8	64	25.2	40	15.7	25	9.8
34	19.8	53	30.8	26	15.1	15	8.7
25	16.1	43	27.7	17	11.0	13	8.4
80	26.3	120	39.5	73	24.0	27	8.9
54	42.2	48	37.5	29	22.7	15	11.7
35	21.3	74	45.1	43	26.2	15	9.1
44	34.6	36	28.3	25	19.7	15	11.8
7	13.7	21	41.2	17	33.3	5	9.8
7	19.4	17	47.2	11	30.6	8	22.2
116	26.0	148	33.2	84	18.8	55	12.3
19	13.5	44	31.2	39	27.7	7	5.0
15	25.4	22	37.3	13	22.0	3	5.1
27	26.0	30	28.8	17	16.3	13	12.5
63	27.4	98	42.6	52	22.6	15	6.5
3	10.7	8	28.6	6	21.4	4	14.3
5	10.9	16	34.8	8	17.4	0	0.0
764	23.4	1155	35.3	694	21.2	326	10.0

TABLE XCIV
(CONTINUED)

Extended School Year		Action Learning		Early Leaving Plan	
f	%	f	%	f	%
8	72.7	6	54.5	5	45.5
57	64.0	52	58.4	34	38.2
45	38.1	16	13.6	4	3.4
88	69.8	78	61.9	47	37.3
316	65.6	278	57.7	159	35.1
159	62.6	143	56.3	52	20.5
139	80.8	93	54.1	50	29.1
95	61.3	45	29.0	28	18.1
192	63.2	217	71.4	102	33.6
106	82.8	101	78.9	90	70.3
111	67.7	96	58.5	32	19.5
80	63.0	37	29.1	26	20.5
21	41.2	26	51.0	20	39.2
22	61.1	9	25.0	9	25.0
285	63.9	302	67.7	143	32.1
50	35.5	39	27.7	26	18.4
34	57.6	20	33.9	5	8.5
51	49.0	34	32.7	27	26.0
190	82.6	156	67.8	86	41.7
23	82.1	9	32.1	7	25.0
28	60.9	15	32.6	7	15.2
2100	64.2	1772	54.2	979	29.9

TABLE XCV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY STATE REPORTING ABANDONMENT OF THIRTY-THREE INNOVATIONS

	PSSC Physics		Harvard Physics		ESCP Physical Science	
State	f	%	f	%	f	%
Unidentified	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Arizona	6	6.7	2	2.2	0	0.0
Arkansas	1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0
Colorado	7	5.6	2	1.6	6	4.8
Illinois	48	10.0	7	1.5	10	2.1
Indiana	19	7.5	3	1.2	3	1.2
Iowa	24	14.0	0	0.0	7	4.1
Kansas	13	8.4	3	1.9	4	2.6
Michigan	37	12.2	2	0.7	3	1.0
Minnesota	17	13.3	4	3.1	3	2.3
Missouri	28	17.1	4	2.4	4	2.4
Nebraska	6	4.7	1	0.8	3	2.4
New Mexico	8	15.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
North Dakota	2	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ohio	26	5.8	3	0.7	7	1.6
Oklahoma	9	6.4	3	2.1	1	0.7
South Dakota	7	11.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
West Virginia	8	7.7	0	0.0	2	1.9
Wisconsin	34	14.8	2	0.9	4	1.7
Wyoming	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dependent's Schools	3	6.5	0	0.0	1	2.2
Total	304	9.3	37	1.1	58	1.8

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

SSSP Physical Science		IPS Physical Science		Humanities Courses		Career Education	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	1.1	9	10.1	0	0.0
2	1.7	0	0.0	7	5.9	2	1.7
1	0.8	4	3.2	6	4.8	1	0.8
7	1.5	26	5.4	41	8.5	3	0.6
2	0.8	11	4.3	6	2.4	1	0.4
1	0.6	4	2.3	10	5.8	0	0.0
1	0.6	4	2.6	7	4.5	1	0.6
1	0.3	12	3.9	28	9.2	1	0.3
3	2.3	2	1.6	4	3.1	0	0.0
2	1.2	4	2.4	12	7.3	0	0.0
0	0.0	5	3.9	3	2.3	1	0.8
0	0.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0.2	6	1.3	34	7.6	2	0.4
0	0.0	4	2.8	11	7.8	6	4.3
0	0.0	2	3.4	2	3.4	0	0.0
0	0.0	2	1.9	2	1.9	0	0.0
2	0.9	6	2.6	18	7.8	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0
1	2.2	11	23.9	8	17.4	0	0.0
24	0.7	105	3.2	211	6.5	18	0.6

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

Independent Study Programs		Mini-Courses		Learning Packages		HSGP Geography	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	2.2	3	3.4	4	4.5	2	2.2
2	1.7	1	0.8	2	1.7	0	0.0
6	4.8	2	1.6	4	3.2	0	0.0
17	3.5	11	2.3	3	0.6	2	0.4
7	2.8	10	3.9	3	1.2	0	0.0
2	1.2	2	1.2	2	1.2	2	1.2
5	3.2	1	0.6	1	0.6	0	0.0
9	3.0	13	4.3	9	3.0	1	0.3
2	1.6	5	3.9	2	1.6	2	1.6
4	2.4	6	3.7	5	3.0	0	0.0
2	1.6	3	2.4	6	4.7	1	0.8
2	3.9	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
1	2.8	1	2.8	3	8.3	1	2.8
16	3.6	18	4.0	10	2.2	1	0.2
3	2.1	4	2.8	0	0.0	1	0.7
1	1.7	2	3.4	3	5.1	0	0.0
3	2.9	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
3	1.3	10	4.3	7	3.0	1	0.4
3	10.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	4.3	5	10.9	1	2.2	0	0.0
92	2.8	99	3.0	67	2.0	14	0.4

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

IPI		SRSS Sociology		Ethnic Studies		Television Instruction	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.2	1	1.1
3	2.5	0	0.0	1	0.8	2	1.7
0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.8	2	1.6
1	0.2	1	0.2	14	2.9	15	3.1
0	0.0	1	0.4	4	1.6	20	7.9
1	0.6	0	0.0	5	2.9	2	1.2
0	0.0	1	0.6	2	1.3	2	1.3
1	0.3	1	0.3	4	1.3	21	6.9
1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.8	12	9.4
1	0.6	0	0.0	2	1.2	9	5.5
0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.4	3	2.4
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.8
0	0.0	0	0.0	7	1.6	18	4.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.1	3	2.1
0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9	3	2.9
0	0.0	1	0.4	3	1.3	6	2.6
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.7	0	0.0
8	0.2	7	0.2	60	1.8	121	3.7

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED

Programmed Instruction		Teaching Machines		Telephone Amplification		Simulation or Gaming	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	9.1
6	6.7	4	4.5	0	0.0	3	3.4
7	5.9	3	2.5	0	0.0	1	0.8
1	0.8	5	4.0	4	3.2	1	0.8
22	4.6	10	2.1	4	0.8	2	0.4
5	2.0	4	1.6	2	0.8	1	0.4
4	2.3	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0
5	3.2	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
15	4.9	6	2.0	1	0.3	0	0.0
7	5.5	2	1.6	3	2.3	0	0.0
14	8.5	5	3.0	3	1.8	1	0.6
2	1.6	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.8
4	7.8	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
4	11.1	0	0.0	3	8.3	0	0.0
24	5.4	6	1.3	5	1.1	3	0.7
6	4.3	3	2.1	1	0.7	2	1.4
1	1.7	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	1.7
2	1.9	1	1.0	2	1.9	0	0.0
5	2.2	4	1.7	2	0.9	0	0.0
2	7.1	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
138	4.2	59	1.8	33	1.0	18	0.6

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

Data Processing Equipment		Computer Assisted Instruction		Flexible Scheduling		Team Teaching	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	18.2
4	4.5	2	2.2	4	4.5	16	18.0
1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	9.3
4	3.2	1	0.8	4	3.2	18	14.3
15	3.1	3	0.6	21	4.4	54	11.2
11	4.3	7	2.8	10	3.9	29	11.4
8	4.7	1	0.6	2	1.2	14	8.1
4	2.6	0	0.0	5	3.2	14	9.0
7	2.3	1	0.3	18	5.9	54	17.8
4	3.1	4	3.1	7	5.5	8	6.3
6	3.7	2	1.2	5	3.0	25	15.2
7	5.5	1	0.8	9	7.1	10	7.9
5	9.8	0	0.0	3	5.9	8	15.7
1	2.8	0	0.0	6	16.7	2	5.6
18	4.0	11	2.5	28	6.3	67	15.0
2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	11	7.8
6	10.2	1	1.7	4	6.8	4	6.8
0	0.0	3	2.9	3	2.9	8	7.7
5	2.2	5	2.2	12	5.2	26	11.3
2	7.1	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	3.6
2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.2	7	15.2
112	3.4	46	1.4	146	4.5	389	11.9

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

College Credit Courses		Non-Graded Programs		Teacher Aides Paraprofessionals	
f	%	f	%	f	%
1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	1.1	0	0,0	6	6.7
0	0.0	2	1.7	2	1.7
1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.8
17	3.5	2	0.4	9	1.9
2	0.8	2	0.8	9	3.5
2	1.2	0	0,0	5	2.9
3	1.9	0	0.0	3	1.9
5	1.6	1	0.3	6	2.0
3	2.3	0	0.0	4	3.1
2	1.2	2	1.2	5	3.0
1	0.8	1	0.8	3	2.4
1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9	2.0	1	0.2	17	3.8
2	1.4	1	0.7	6	4.3
2	3.4	1	1.7	5	8.5
1	1.0	0	0.0	14	13.5
5	2.2	0	0.0	6	2.6
1	3.6	1	3.6	1	3.6
1	2.2	0	0.0	3	6.5
60	1.8	15	0.5	106	3.2

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

Differentiated Staffing		School-Within-A-School		Cultural Enrichment Programs		Optional Class Attendance	
f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0
1	0.8	2	1.6	0	0.0	4	3.2
1	0.2	8	1.7	4	0.8	6	1.2
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6	1	0.6
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	2	1.3
3	1.0	4	1.3	2	0.7	7	2.3
2	1.6	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	0.6	2	1.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.9	1	2.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4	4	0.9
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0
1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
0	0.0	1	0.4	3	1.3	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9	0.3	19	0.6	24	0.7	27	0.8

TABLE XCV
(CONTINUED)

Extended School Year		Action Learning		Early Leaving Plan	
f	%	f	%	f	%
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	2	2.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0.2	5	1.0	6	1.2
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	2	1.2	1	0.6
0	0.0	3	1.9	1	0.6
3	1.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0
0	0.0	2	1.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.8
0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0.4	1	0.2	3	0.7
0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7
0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
1	1.0	2	1.9	0	0.0
0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.4
0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8	0.2	24	0.7	19	0.6

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Department of Educational Administration

207 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Telephone (3[illegible]4) 882-8221

April 9, 1974

Dear Colleague:

Approximately three weeks ago we mailed to you a questionnaire dealing with the status of certain innovative practices in member schools of the North Central Association. The purpose of the study is to gather information which will be helpful in understanding how to better effect lasting educational change.

The response we have received has been extremely encouraging. However, the strength of the study depends upon its representativeness, and we are making a special effort to contact each participant who has not yet returned the questionnaire. Your response is extremely valuable in the conclusion of this study. We look forward to receiving your reply.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.

Cordially yours,

John DeArman

John W. DeArman
Researcher

ms

an equal opportunity institution

University of Missouri - Columbia

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

March 11, 1974

Dear Colleague:

In 1966 Dr. Gordon Cawelti conducted a study of all accredited secondary schools in the nation in an attempt to discover to what extent they had adopted certain innovative practices.

We are attempting to extend Dr. Cawelti's study to discover, not only the extent of adoption of innovations in secondary schools in the North Central Association, but also which innovations have been abandoned and the reasons for abandonment.

Enclosed is a copy of a questionnaire. By completing it you will be providing an invaluable service in helping us gather information which can contribute to a better understanding of planning educational change as well as understanding the conditions which help insure the success of innovations.

We hope that you will complete the questionnaire and return it by April 5, 1974. No school will be identified with its responses. It is not necessary that you sign the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Cordially yours,

Dr. Neil C. Aslin	Dr. John A. Stanavage	Mr. John De Arman
State Chairman	Executive Secretary	Researcher
Missouri North Central Association	Secondary Commission	College of Education
	North Central Association	University of Missouri

ms

enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Department of Educational Administration

207 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Telephone (314) 882-8221

April 22, 1974

Dear Colleague:

Recently you were asked to complete a questionnaire dealing with the status of innovative practices in member schools of the North Central Association. The purpose of this study is to gather information which will contribute to an understanding of how to better effect lasting educational change.

The response we have received has been extremely encouraging. Because the strength of the study rests upon its representativeness, we are making a special effort to contact each participant who has not yet returned a questionnaire in an attempt to enlist his support. We value your contribution and would like very much to include your responses in our study. Another questionnaire has been included for your convenience. We look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.

Cordially yours,

John DeArman

John W. DeArman
Researcher

ms

an equal opportunity institution

ASCD

Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

TO: Survey Participants

FROM: Gordon Cawelti, Executive Secretary G Cawelti

DATE: February 6, 1974

Mr. John De Arman is undertaking a very significant study concerning the abandonment of school innovations. I believe his findings will be useful to other school systems in preventing problems that might have been anticipated. I urge you to cooperate with John in providing the data he requests.

GC/cc

1701 K Street, N.W. • Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006 • (202) 467-6480

GORDON CAWELTI, Executive Secretary

ASCD

THE ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

A National Affiliate of the National Education Association • 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 833-4072

November 12, 1973

Mr. John DeArman
College of Education
207 Hill Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Dear John:

I have reviewed your survey form and make the following suggestions:

1) It may be wise to broaden black studies to ethnic studies since this is a broader area than just the black studies program - in the southwestern part of the United States there may be more attention to the Indian or Mexican-American heritage than to the black.

2) The television item should have a definition including cable TV which is growing more rapidly now than closed circuit television.

3) I believe telephone amplification has never caught on very much and could well be omitted.

4) The whole area of "action learning" is receiving considerable emphasis now by NASSP and other groups. I'm sure you're familiar with this but it includes programs for getting students out into the real world with adults on a paid or nonpaid basis in social service agencies or industry. I think this might very well be a useful additional item.

5) Perhaps you should include an attempt to see whether or not anything is developing with respect to plans encouraging certain students to be able to leave high school earlier than at the conventional age. I know that at least Oregon and probably some other states are working at this in an attempt to deal with the restlessness and inadequacy of conventional secondary schooling for many youth.

6) A number of high schools have specific programs preparing 18-year-olds to vote. You might want to see if anything has been started.

I realize that a number of these suggestions refer to some more recent developments. Since your interest is primarily in abandonment they may not be appropriate. I'm sending them along for what they are worth and simply add that I believe the other items that you have included are very appropriate for this kind of study.

Officers, 1973-74: President, HAROLD G. SHANE, University Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington • President Elect, GLENYS G. UNRUH, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, School District of University City, University City, Missouri • Immediate Past President, JACK R. FRYMIER, Professor and Chairman, Curriculum and Foundations Faculty, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus • Executive Secretary, GORDON CAWELTI

Professional Staff: Associate Secretary and Editor of ASCD Publications, ROBERT R. LEEPER • Associate Secretary, CLARK DOBSON

Member, Alliance of Associations for the Advancement of Education

Please give Neil my best regards.

Sincerely,

Gordon Cawelti

Gordon Cawelti
Executive Secretary

GC:ea
Enclosure

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS

MISSOURI STATE COMMITTEE

NEIL C. ASLIN, CHAIRMAN
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
207 HILL HALL
COLUMBIA, MISSOURI 65201
TELEPHONE: 314-882-8221

R. D. KERR, ASSOCIATE STATE CHAIRMAN
FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
209 HILL HALL
COLUMBIA, MISSOURI 65201
TELEPHONE: 314-882-4027

P. J. NEWELL, ASST. COMMISSIONER
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JEFFERSON CITY 65101

LARRY ACKLEY, PRINCIPAL
FARMINGTON HIGH SCHOOL
FARMINGTON 63640

REV. JOHN WURM
ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT
ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS
ST. LOUIS 63108

GENE WHITMER, PRINCIPAL
RICHMOND HIGH SCHOOL
RICHMOND 64085

PERCY CARUTHERS, PRINCIPAL
LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL
KANSAS CITY 64108

DAVID SIPPY, PRINCIPAL
MONETT HIGH SCHOOL
MONETT 65708

COMMISSION OFFICERS

DAVID A. WILKERSON, CHAIRMAN
EXECUTIVE SECONDARY PRINCIPAL
POUDRE R-1 SCHOOLS
2407 LAPORTE AVENUE
FORT COLLINS, COLORADO 80521

JOHN A. STANAVAGE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
5454 SOUTH SHORE DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60615

November 1, 1974

Dear Colleague:

During March, 1974 we sent to your school a questionnaire dealing with the status of certain innovative practices. Your response is appreciated very much.

The National Institute of Education, which is funding the study, has asked that further information be gathered to complete the study. We would be most grateful if you could complete this last short questionnaire which is enclosed and return it in the postage paid envelope provided.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

John DeArman

John DeArman, Researcher
University of Missouri

JD/dmh

Seventy-ninth Annual Meeting, March 24–27, 1974, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois

VITA

JOHN WILLIAM DE ARMAN

Born: October 12, 1936 - Dexter, Missouri

Family: Spouse - Irene Cheek DeArman
Children - Sharon Krynn DeArman
Karin Elaine DeArman
Kristi Lynn DeArman

Education: Elementary and secondary schools - Dexter, Missouri (1941-1954)
Bachelor of Arts Degree, History - Trevecca College - Nashville, Tennessee (1954-1959)
Master of Science in Education Degree - Arkansas State University - Jonesboro (1960-1961)
University of Missouri - Columbia (1970-1975)

Professional Experience: Teacher, Dexter Public Schools - Dexter, Missouri (1959-1963)
Principal, Dexter Junior High School (1963-1967)
Principal, Dexter Senior High School (1967-1973)
Executive Secretary, Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals - Columbia, Missouri (1973-1974)
Assistant Superintendent-Instruction - North Kansas City School District (1974-   )

Professional Membership: Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Secondary School Principals; Phi Delta Kappa; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Missouri Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Professional Service: Member, Advisory Committee on Curriculum, National Association of Secondary School Principals; President, campus chapter Phi Delta Kappa, Arkansas State University, Co-chairman, Visiting Committees, North Central Association; Director, workshops on evaluation of instruction, Southeast Missouri State University, 1973.